REFLECTIONS
ON
Ancient and *Modern*
LEARNING.

The Second Part.

WITH A
DISSERTATION
UPON
The EPISTLES of

PHALARIS, THEMISTOCLES, SOCRATES, } { EURIPIDES; &c. AND FABLES of ÆSOP.

By *RICHARD BENTLEY*, D. D.
Chaplain in Ordinary, and Library Keeper to His Majesty.

These Additions Compleat the want of the former Eddition.

LONDON,
Printed for *P. B.* and sold by *Richard Wellington*, at the Lute in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*. MDCXCVIII.

ADDITIONS
TO THE
SECOND EDITION
OF
Mr. *Wotton's Reflections*
UPON
Ancient and *Modern Learning.*

[*Addit.* Pag. 148, &c.]

CHAP. XII.

Of the Learning of the Ancient Indians *and* Chineſes.

WE are now arrived in our Paſſage Eaſtward as far as the *Indies*, where the firſt Springs of that Learning which afterwards flow'd always Weſtward, aroſe. Thither *Pythagoras* is ſaid to have gone, and to have fetch'd from thence his celebrated Doctrine of the *Tranſmigration of Souls*, which he taught, and is now believed by the Modern *Bramines* as it was the Opinion of the *Brachmans* of old.

We have very little if any Account of theſe *Indian* Philoſophers before *Alexander the Great*, who extended his Conqueſts as far as the River *Indus*. His Hiſtorians acquaint us with a Set of Philoſophers in that Countrey, who practiſed great Auſterities themſelves, and taught others that Wiſdom lay in living upon a little, in Abſtaining from almoſt all ſorts of Natural Pleaſures, and Promoting the Proſperity and Welfare of the reſt of Mankind. The Deſcription that *Strabo* gives us of them, out of *Megaſthenes*, *Oneſicritus* and *Ariſtobulus*, which is very well Abridged by Sir *W. T.* is the Fulleſt and moſt Authentic that we have. And that the Body of it may be true, is probable from the Accounts of their Succeſſors the *Bramines*, which are given us by Monſieur *Bernier*, and *Abraham Roger*, who lived many Years among them, and made it their Buſineſs to collect their Opinions with all the Exactneſs they could.

The ſuperſtitious Care which theſe People take to follow the Cuſtoms, and propagate the Opinions of their Anceſtors, be they never ſo abſurd and ſenſeleſs, plainly ſhews that they would have preſerved their Learning with equal Care, had there been any of it to preſerve. They keep a Collection of the wiſe Sayings of one *Barthrouherri*,

throuherri, which Monſieur *Roger* has given us a Taſt of; but ſuch miſerable Stuff, for the generality, that one cannot read them without ſmiling at the Simplicity of thoſe that can admire them. They wou'd not ſhew Monſieur *Roger* their Book of the Law, which they pretend to be ſent from God; but by the Account which his *Bramine* Doctor gave of it, it is only an abſurd Hiſtory of the fabulous Succeſſions of their Deities, and as abſurd a Collection of ſuperſtitious Ceremonies, by which they were to be worſhipped. Their Doctrine of the *Tranſmigration of Souls*, which *Pythagoras* firſt taught in the Weſt, is a precarious idle Notion, which theſe beſotted *Indians* do ſo blindly believe, that they are afraid of killing a Flea or a Louſe, for fear of diſturbing the Soul of one of their Anceſtors. Though at the ſame time they ſcruple not to force multitudes of poor ſilly Women, and ſometimes too, full ſore againſt their Wills, to burn themſelves alive with their deceaſed Husband's Bodies, under a pretence of their being ſerviceable to them in another World, though they are far from having any aſſurance that their Husbands will there ſtand in need of them. Can we believe that there is a generous Spirit reſiding in a People, who have now for $\overline{MM}$ or $\overline{MMM}$ Years placed the higheſt de-

grees of Sanctity and Prudence in half-ſtarving themſelves, and depriving themſelves of the lawful Conveniences of Life? Yet theſe were the chiefeſt Employments of the Ancient *Brachmans*, as they are ſtill of the Modern *Bramines*.

So that there is reaſon to fear that the Stories of the extraordinary Wiſdom of the Ancient *Brachmans* are in a great meaſure fabulous, becauſe in the idle and bigotted part of the Narrative they do ſo particularly agree with the Modern *Bramines*; and alſo, becauſe if one conſults what the Ancients have recorded of the *Brachmans* in *Alexander*'s time, which is all gathered into a Body by (*a*) Sir *Edward Byſhe*, he will find that the Accounts which come the neareſt to the Fountain, have leſs in them of the Romance, (*b*) and that their Hiſtorians have expatiated and flouriſh'd more, as they were at the greater diſtance. For, upon comparing what all thoſe Authors there quoted have ſaid, I am enclinable to believe, that all we know of the Ancient *Brachmans*, is due to the Accounts which *Alexander*'s Companions have given us.

(*a*) *Palladius de Gentibus Indiæ, & Bragmanibus* Edit. Biſſei Lond. 1665.

(*b*) Let but any Man compare *Strabo* and *Palladius* together, and he will ſee the difference, tho' 'tis plain they relate to the ſame Time.

But let us enter into Particulars. Sir *W. T.* tells us, out of *Strabo*; (*c*) "That their "Opi-

(*c*) Lib. 15.

" Opinions in Natural Philoſophy, were, " that the *World* was *Round* ; that it had " a Beginning, and wou'd have an End, " but reckoned both by immenſe Periods " of Time ; that the Author of it was a " Spirit, or a Mind that pervaded the " whole Univerſe, and was diffuſed through " all the Parts of it ; and, that they held " the Tranſmigration of Souls, and ſome " uſed Diſcourſes of Infernal Manſions, in " many things like thoſe of (*d*) *Plato.*" Whether *Megaſthenes*, from whom *Strabo* takes all this Account, has not made it a little more beautiful than he ought, I very much queſtion, ſince Monſieur *Bernier* ſays, (*e*) That the *Bramines* believe, " That " the *Earth* is *Flat* and *Triangular*, with " ſeveral Stories, all differing in Beauty, " Perfection and Inhabitants, each of which " is encompaſſed, they ſay, by its Sea ; " that one of theſe Seas is of Milk, ano- " ther of Sugar, the third of Butter, the " fourth of Wine, and ſo forth : ſo that " after one Earth there comes a Sea, and " after a Sea an Earth, and ſo on to ſeven, " beginning from *Someire* (*f*), which is " in the midſt of theſe Stories : That the " firſt Story, which is at the foot of *So-* " *meire*, hath *Deuta's* (*g*) for its Inhabi- " tants, which are very perfect ; that the " ſecond contains likewiſe *Deuta's*, but leſs

(*d*) *Eſſay*, pag. 17.

(*e*) *Voyages*, Tom. III. pag. 168. Edit. Eng.

(*f*) An Imaginary Mountain, whichthey place in the midſt of the Earth.

(*g*) The Semi-Gods of the *Bramines*.

" perfect ; and ſo of the reſt, ſtill leſſen-
" ing the Perfection to the ſeventh, which,
" they ſay, is ours, that is, of Men far
" leſs perfect than all the *Deuta's* : And,
" laſtly, That this whole Maſs is ſuſtained
" upon the Heads of divers Elephants,
" which when they ſtir, cauſe an Earth-
" quake." Upon all this, and abundance more of the like nature in *Aſtronomy*, *Anatomy*, *Medicine*, and *Phyſic's*, which ſeems to be the true Oriental Doctrine, conſonant to thoſe noble Diſcoveries which are in (*h*) Monſieur *Roger's Hiſtory of the Lives and Manners of the Bramines*, Monſieur *Bernier* makes this Remark ; (*i*) " All theſe
" ſtrange Impertinencies, which I have had
" the patience to relate, have often made
" me think, that if *they* be thoſe famous
" Sciences of the Ancient *Brachmans* of
" the *Indies*, very many have been de-
" ceived in the great Opinion they enter-
" tained of them. For my part, I can
" hardly believe it, but that I find the
" Religion of the *Indians* to be from im-
" memorial Times ; that 'tis written in
" the *Hanſcrit* Language, which cannot
" but be very ancient, ſince its begin-
" ning is unknown, and 'tis a *dead* Lan-
" guage, not underſtood but by the
" Learned ; that *all* their Books are only
" written in that Tongue : all which
" are

(*h*) *Hiſtoire de la Vie & des Moeurs des Bramines.*

(*i*) P. 169.

" are as many Marks of a very great An-
" tiquity." This, by the way, confutes the Opinion of thoſe (*k*) who make the *Indian* Learning to be all Traditionary; for not only their Religious, but their Profane Knowledge too, is all written in this *Hanſcrit* Dialect.

(*k*) Sir *W. T.* his *Eſſay*, p. 17.

Yet one Notion of theſe *Bramines* I cannot but take notice of, becauſe it is a very Philoſophical one, and has been with probability ſtarted and defended by ſome of the moſt curious Anatomiſts of the preſent Age, who built their Hypotheſis upon the lateſt Diſcoveries which have been made in that admirable Art: I ſhall ſet it down in Monſieur *Bernier*'s words; (*l*) " The
" Seeds of Plants and Animals are not
" formed a-new, but were contrived in the
" firſt Production of the World, and diſ-
" penſed abroad every where, and mixed
" in all things; and that they are not
" only potentially but actually the very
" and entire Plants, and Animals, tho'
" ſo ſmall, that their Parts cannot be
" diſtinguiſht, but when put into a
" convenient Womb, and there nouriſht,
" they extend themſelves and encreaſe:
" So that the Seeds of an Apple and Pear-
" Tree, are a little, entire, and perfect
" Apple and Pear-Tree, having all its
" Eſſential Parts; and ſo the Seeds of an

(*l*) P. 175, 176.

" Horſe, an Elephant, a Man, &c. are a " little Horſe, a little Elephant, a little " Man, in which there wants nothing but " the Soul and Nouriſhment to make " them appear what they are."

This Opinion ſeems rather to have been maintained by a *Leeuwenhoek*, or a *Malpighius*, than by an *Indian*, who, as Monſieur *Bernier* aſſures us, (*m*) *underſtands nothing at all of Anatomy, and can ſpeak nothing upon that Subject but what is impertinent.* Had it been the Reſult of Thought and Meditation, founded upon proper Premiſes, which muſt be the Effects of many and repeated Obſervations, one *might* juſtly have looked for, and *would* infallibly have found many other Notions of equal Subtilty among theſe *Bramines*; which tho' erroneous, (and ſo, perhaps, may this be,) yet could not have been made by any but Skilful Men. Such Diſcoveries likewiſe would have obliged us to have entertain'd a very honourable Notion of the Learning of the Ancient *Brachmans*; becauſe, tho' they *might* have been Modern, in compariſon of thoſe Ancient Times, yet they *might not* alſo, for ought we knew, and conſequently might have been challenged to thoſe Ancient Philoſophers by their Modern Champions. But when, amidſt a vaſt variety of wild and fantaſtical Opi-

(*m*) Pag. 166.

nions,

nions, a Man meets with one or two which ſtand alone by themſelves, without any thing that appears to have raiſed or confirmed them, he ought not preſently to conclude, that the Philoſophers who maintain them are Wiſe and Learned Men, tho' once, perhaps, or twice, *Quod nequit Ingenium, Caſus fecit.*

[*Addit.* Pag. 290, &c.]

CHAP. XXII.

Of Ancient and Modern Agriculture and Gardening.

THE *Ancients* put ſo great a Value upon the Country-man's Arts, and we have ſo many Treatiſes ſtill extant concerning them, written by their greateſt Philoſophers, their ableſt Philologers, and their beſt Poets; that to ſay nothing of them, may be thought an inexcuſable Omiſſion. *Husbandry* and *Gardening* are Subjects upon which *Theophraſtus* (*Ariſtotle*'s Darling Diſciple,) *Varro* (who is ſaid to be the Learnedeſt of all the *Romans*,) and *Pliny* (perhaps no-way his inferior) have written large Diſcourſes yet remaining. *Varro* and *Pliny* quote Numbers of Authors,

thors, ſome of them no leſs than Crowned Heads, ſince loſt. *Heſiod*, whom ſome of the Ancients make older than *Homer*, and *Virgil* the Prince of *Roman* Poets, have left us Precepts of theſe Arts. *Columella* ſays, they are related to Philoſophy it ſelf, which thoſe Heathen Sages priz'd ſo highly: And the later *Roman* Writers are ſtill upbraiding the Luxury of their own Times, which wholly took off their Minds from theſe moſt uſeful Employments, and ſending their effeminate Country-men back to their renowned Anceſtors who went from the Plough to the Camp, and having there commanded victorious Armies, returned back again to the Plough, to redeem the Time they had loſt.

There is no doubt but great Things were done in theſe Arts by the Ancients: Had we no Books extant to acquaint us with their Knowledge, yet the thing ſhews it ſelf: Countries cannot be peopled by civilized Nations, nor great Cities fill'd, nor Trade carried on by polite and induſtrious Inhabitants, unleſs the Arts of Husbandry flouriſh. Mankind, without them, would be Wild, like the *Negroes*, and *American* Salvages, or *Arabs*. But yet one Nation may be much more Knowing in theſe Things than another, and one Age conſequently, though all may have

Skill

Skill enough to anſwer the Neceſſities of Civil Life.

In making my Compariſon, I ſhall comprehend all that the Ancients underſtood by their *Res Ruſtica*, as it takes in the *Foreſter*'s, the *Husbandman*'s, and the *Gardener*'s Buſineſs: *Cato*, *Varro*, and *Columella* include the *Grazier*'s alſo, thereby compleating the whole Body of *Farming*; but ſince his Work cannot well be made a Science of, I ſhall omit it.

By a *Foreſter* here, I underſtand one that knows how to Plant, Propagate and Encreaſe all ſorts of Timber Trees; what Soils are proper for every ſort; how they may beſt be defended from Dangers in their Growth; to what Uſes they are moſt applicable, when they have arrived to their utmoſt Perfection; and how they may be beſt applied: Such a Man, in ſhort, as Mr. *Evelyn* inſtructs in his *Sylva*, where he gives a full Syſtem of the *Woodman*'s Skill; what he ought to know, and what to practiſe. A great part of his Work, and indeed the Niceſt part of it, the Ancients were Strangers to, as having leſs occaſion for it. The World was then, comparatively ſpeaking, in its Infancy; there was no want of Wood for Fuel, Building, or Ships; and this Plenty made Men leſs curious in Contriving

triving Methods of Preſerving what they had in ſo great abundance. *England*, till within a few Ages, was every where over-run with Wood: The *Hercynian* Foreſt anciently took up what is now the moſt flouriſhing part of *Germany*: And *France*, which is at preſent ſo wonderfully Populous, that little Cultivable Ground remains Untill'd, was in *Cæſars*'s time over-ſpread with Woods and Foreſts. As Men encreaſe, Tillage becomes more and more requiſite; the conſumption of Wood will be proportionably greater; and its want, and the neceſſary Uſes of Timber, which grow upon Men as they become more numerous, will of conſequence put them upon ways to preſerve and encreaſe it. Commerce with diſtant Parts, will ſhew Men rare and uſeful Trees, to which their own Soil was before a ſtranger; and Luxury will ſoon teach them to tranſplant them.

No wonder therefore if Modern Writers excell the Ancients, upon a Subject which they had leſs occaſion for. The *Romans*, indeed, were curious in Planting Trees for Shade or Fruit; but their Induſtry in that particular comes under another Head, as rather belonging to the *Gardener*'s Work. It may therefore, perhaps be eſteemed a ſmall Character of Mr. *Evelyn*'s *Diſcourſe of Foreſt Trees*, to ſay,

ſay, that it Out-does all that *Theophraſtus* and *Pliny* have left us on that Subject: For it not only does that, and a great deal more, but contains more uſeful Precepts, Hints and Diſcoveries upon that now ſo neceſſary a part of our *Res Ruſtica*, than the World had till then known from all the Obſervations of former Ages. To name others after him, would be a derogation to his Performance.

Agriculture properly ſo called, has been always neceſſary ſince *Noah*'s time, when the Flood, that *deſtroy'd the World of the Ungodly*, wrought ſuch a change upon the Face of the Earth, as made it neceſſary for all Mankind *in the ſweat of their brows to eat their bread.* And the early Populouſneſs of the Eaſtern Nations, (though I would not bring *Semiramis* and *Zoroaſter*'s Armies to prove it) ſhews how much it was followed. For though thoſe Countries ſhould be allowed to be, as they really are, marvellouſly Fruitful; yet even *Ægypt*, and the Plains of *Babylonia*, muſt be Tilled, to yield a Crop to ſatisfie the Hunger of their Inhabitants. Weſtward, as the World was later Peopled, ſo Tillage was proportionably later; and the *Athenians* tell of one *Triptolemus*, who learn'd the Art of Sowing Corn of the

the *Ægyptians*, above a Thouſand Years after *Noah*'s Flood (*c*). After that, Neceſſity taught them many Rules; and it is evident from *Theophraſtus*, and the *Roman* Writers of *Geoponic's*, that their Knowledge in this kind was very great. They were thoroughly verſed in the Art of Dreſſing their Grounds, and the Seaſons when it was proper to do every part of a Husbandman's Work: what Compoſt was fit to meliorate their overwrought or barren Lands; what Soil was beſt for this Grain, and what for that. Their Vines and Olives, which were their Farmer's care, were managed with much Skill and Curioſity; and *Pliny* reckons up a great many ſorts of both of them, which the Luxury of that Age had taught them to cultivate. In a word; They were Induſtrious and Skilful Husbandmen; and perhaps, 'tis not poſſible to tell, at this diſtance, whether our Farmers manage their Grounds more judiciouſly than they did theirs: ſince any Improvements particular to one Climate and Soil, do not prove that Age in which they are made, more Knowing than another, wherein ſuch Improvements could take no place: though at the ſame time, a Countrey naturally barren, which has a weak Sun in an unkindly Climate, requires

(*n*) Vid. *Marſhami Chronicon.* pag. 249. Edit. *Lond.*

requires more Skill, as well as more Induſtry, to make it fertile. And therefore it may be queſtion'd, whether, conſidering the Natural Felicity of the Soils of *Sicily*, *Africa* and *Greece*, and much more of *Ægypt*, *Judæa* and *Babylonia*, whoſe Fertility was anciently, with Reaſon, ſo much extolled, the Improvements in *England*, *Scotland* and *Holland* may not juſtly come into competition with any ancient Performances; which how great ſoever in themſelves, were yet leſs upon this account, that the Husbandmen in thoſe Regions had not ſuch Difficulties to ſtruggle with.

But though the Ancients, probably, underſtood the Art of Sowing Wheat, and Barley, and Legumes, and Flax, and how to manage their Vines and Olives, as well as any Age has done ſince; yet other things of unſpeakable uſe they were wholly ſtrangers to. The Art of Making *Cyder*, at leaſt of Chuſing the beſt Apples, and Managing their Orchards and Plantations accordingly, they knew little or nothing of. And here again I muſt remember to take notice, (which, upon every opportunity, I gladly do,) that Mr. *Evelyn's Pomona* has taught the preſent Age many things concerning the way of Ordering Apple-Trees, and Making

Cyder,

Cyder, to which the World, till then, were wholly Strangers, and for which he ought here to be mention'd with Honour. The *Sugar-Cane* was not anciently unknown, ſince it grows naturally in *Arabia* and *Indoſtan*; but ſo little was the Old World acquainted with the Nature of its delicious Juice, that ſome of their ableſt Men doubted whether it were a Dew like Manna, or the Juice of the Plant it ſelf. All the Arts and Methods therefore of Preparing Sugar, which have made it ſo very uſeful to Humane Life, are owing to Modern *Portuguezes* and *Engliſh*. *Malt-Drinks* were uſed in *Gaul* and *Spain* anciently; as alſo in *Ægypt*, where, probably, they were firſt invented: but whether they were ſo accurately made as ours, no Man can tell, unleſs he knew certainly whether and with what they fermented them. May I not farther inſtance in *Coffee* and *Tobacco*? The *Romans* drove a greater Trade in *Arabia*, and were better acquainted with its Commodities, than this part of the World has been at any time ſince, which no Man that has ever read the Thirteenth Book of *Pliny*'s *Natural Hiſtory* can poſſibly doubt of; yet there is no one Syllable of any thing like *Coffee* in his whole Work, nor indeed in any other

Ancient

Ancient Author before the *Arabs*. It is very probable that it grows wild in *Arabia*, ſince it is known to grow no where elſe; and that the Prohibition of Wine by the *Mahometan* Law, made the *Arabs* find out its Virtues, (whereas before it was a neglected Shrub) to ſupply the place of the other Liquor. But ſtill its Cultivation is, as to the preſent Queſtion, Modern; and ſince the *Arabs* do now beſtow great Care and Pains in Managing it, it comes not improperly in among the Augmentations of *Modern Agriculture*. And that *Tobacco* ought here to be mention'd, is queſtion'd by none who know what a Delight and Refreſhment it is to ſo many Nations, ſo many ſeveral ways. The Accounts of *Virginia* and *Braſil* will inform us what pains our *Europæan* Planters are at, to make that Herb palatable to all ſorts of Perſons. So that without taking notice of any more Particulars, we may be aſſured, that the *Modern Huſbandry* is a *larger*, if not a more *exact* thing than the *Ancient*; and even in thoſe things wherein the Ancients did moſt excell, in the Management of their Vines and Olives, the comparative Excellency of the later Ages will perhaps be allowed by all thoſe who are acquainted with the Curioſity of the pre-

 ſent,

ſent, in Managing of their Fruit-Trees; which ſhall be treated of in its proper place.

I deferred to ſpeak of *Gardening* till the laſt; becauſe Luxury always comes after Neceſſity; though, generally, when it is once introduced, it ſtill goes on encreaſing, till it is come to the utmoſt pitch to which it can be carried. In the preſent Subject, we ſhall find a gradual Improvement ſo very viſible, that I hope to put it paſt controverſie.

The Babylonian *Horti Penſiles*, or Gardens on the tops of Buildings, ought, in moſt Men's Opinion, firſt to be mention'd in point of Antiquity. Theſe, *Joſephus* aſſures us, were only large Walks of Trees planted on the tops of Mounts of Maſons Work, erected in the midſt of the City by *Nebuchadnezzar*, to pleaſe his Wife. If they are no older, *Alcinous*'s Garden, deſcribed by *Homer* (*o*), was long before them. There one ſees the Simplicity of that Heroical Age very plainly. The Poet thought he did a magnificent thing, when he made it Four Acres in circumference: He tells us, it was ſtored with Pear-Trees and Apple-Trees, Pomegranates and Figs, Vines and Olives, which furniſhed him with conſtant ſucceſſions of Fruit; and had

(*o*) *Odyſſ.* lib. viii.

had two Fountains, one cut into Streams, to water it within; the other flowing from thence, to ſupply the Neceſſities of the Inhabitants of the Town. And this is all he ſays of it: Poets and Romancers deſcribe every thing for their Hero's uſes, as ſplendidly as they can, what they have ſeen, read, or heard of, is always brought in, as 'tis expected it ſhould. Accordingly the Garden deſcribed by *Euſtathius* (*p*), in the later times of the *Græcian* Empire, when Luxury was improved into an Art, which it was far from being in old *Homer*'s time, is much finer, though far ſhort of the Gardens and *Villa*'s of the Princes and Great Men of the preſent Age. *Euſtathius*'s Garden has open and arched Walks of Lawrel, Cypreſs and Myrtle, with Arbors of Vines for the Conveniencies of the Gueſts, to gather the Grapes as they lay at their Meals by the Fountain-ſide; with a *Jet d'eau* in the middle of it, ſpouting Water out of an Eagle's Bill; by which a She-Goat was milked, with the Liquor dropping out of the Nipples into a Pail on purpoſe: round the Fountain are Swallows and Peacocks, Doves and Cocks, all either Caſt or Carved, out of whoſe Bills the Water flowing, gave a Sound to the ſeveral Birds. This indeed is very

(*p*) *Amorum Yſminiæ & Yſmines*, l. i.

pleaſant and poetical, and ſhews, that *Euſtathius* had ſeen or heard of ſomething of this nature, by which he guided his Fancy.

What the *Roman* Gardens were, we are ſufficiently taught by their Writers of *Countrey Affairs*: (*q*) *Columella*'s and (*r*) *Pliny*'s Precepts and Deſcriptions are fit for nothing elſe but a Kitchen-Garden: They give Directions for Ordering Cucumbers, Melons, Artichokes, Coleworts, Turneps, Radiſhes, Parſnips, Skirrets, Garlick, Leeks, Onions, Aſparagus, and a numerous train of Pot-Herbs, with a little Garden-Phyſic. They both aſſign this as the reaſon why *Virgil* would ſay nothing of Gardening, in his *Georgic's*; it being a Subject ſo very poor and jejune, that it would not bear the Ornaments which that Divine Poet gave to all his Works: So they ſeem to underſtand his *Spatia iniqua* which he complains of, upon which account he left off where he did.

(q) Lib. x. *tot. & lib.* xi. cap. 3.

(r) Lib. xix.

For if we fanſie that the Gardens of *Lucullus*, *Pompey*, *Cicero*, *Mecœnas*, *Seneca*, and of all thoſe Great *Romans* which are ſo highly extolled by the Ancients, were what we ordinarily call Gardens, we are very much miſtaken: Their Gardens were ſpacious Plats of Ground, filled and ſur-

ſurrounded with ſtately Walks of Platan's, and other ſhady Trees, built round with Xyſti, Portico's, finely paved with curiouſly coloured and far-fetch'd Marble, laid in artificial Figures, noble Ranges of Pillars, adorned within with Fiſh-Ponds, Aviaries, Fountains and Statues. Such ſtill are the Villa's of the *Italian* Princes at *Fraſcati*, *Tivoli*, and their other delicious Seats in *Latium* and *Campania*, ſo celebrated of old, for being the Gardens of the *Europæan* World. Such, in ſome meaſure, are the famous Gardens about *Iſpahan*, where Shade and Coolneſs give them their greateſt Pleaſure, in a Region where the Soil naturally furniſhes its Inhabitants with excellent Fruit, and fragrant Flowers; ſo that they are at little pains to cultivate that which they can have without, and which would not afford half that Delight in their Gardens of Pleaſure, that they find in lying, in the cool of the Day, under a ſhady *Plane*, by a Fountain-ſide. This made the Ancients, who all lived in warm Climates, admire the *Plane* ſo exceedingly, that frantic Stories are told of *Xerxes*'s doting upon one in the *Leſſer Aſia*, when he was bringing down his mighty Armies againſt *Greece* (*s*). The Walks of *Academus*, and the Gardens of *Epicurus*, were

(*s*) *Ælian. Var. Hiſt.* 2. 14.

of this ſort, Cool and Delicious; but which can give us no Idea of the Artificial Beauties of Modern Gardens. For the Queſtion is not, which is in it ſelf pleaſanter; or, whether if we lived in *Greece* or *Perſia*, we ſhould not rather chuſe to imitate the Faſhion of thoſe Countries: but, which ſhews the greateſt Skill of him that makes it.

The Gardens of this Age are of ſeveral ſorts, *for the Kitchen*, *for Flowers*, *for Greens*, and *Shady Walks*, *for Fruit-Trees*, and *for the Apothecary*.

To the Firſt of theſe, the Induſtry of the Ancients (as we have ſeen already) was in a manner wholly confined. That they knew how to manage thoſe Kitchen Stores which their Gardens yielded, is unqueſtionable; but their Variety was not near ſo great, ſince neither was the New World known, nor the Old ſo well examined as it has been ſince. Beſides, they knew little of the Art of Raiſing Summer Plants, in the ſevereſt Froſts, and ſo making all Seaſons of the Year unite in one, at Great Men's Tables; the bringing which to the preſent Perfection, is due to theInduſtry and Sagacity of the Age we live in; which how much it has enlarged this part of Gardening from what it was anciently, every Man by him-

himſelf will eaſily imagine. The *Romans*, indeed, had a way of Preſerving Melons in Winter, by Sowing them in a large Box fill'd with rich Mold and Dung, which they houſed in Winter, and expoſed in Sun-ſhiny Days under their *Specularia*, that ſeem to have been of the nature of our Glaſſes: by which Contrivance, *Tiberius* the Emperor had Melons all the Year round. That ſhews what Neceſſity might have forced them to, had they been put to it.

As for *Flower Gardens*, the Ancients minded them not. They require an open Sun, and a free Air, which in hot Countries would have been Nuiſanſes, rather than Delights. Plants remarkable for their Beauty or their Smell, had a place indeed in their Plantations; but we find no mention of any great Variety of Species, or Art in Ranging or Managing thoſe they had. There is nothing ſaid in any *Greek* or *Roman* Authors of large Gravel-Walks, ſurrounding ſpacious Graſs-Plats, edged with beautiful Borders, fill'd with all that choice of Auricula's, Tulipa's, Carnations, Tuberoſes, Jonquilles, Lily's, Hyacinths, Narciſſus's, and that almoſt infinite diverſity of Beautiful and Odoriferous Flowers that now adorn our *Gardens*. They knew not the Art of Diver-

ſifying the Colours, Enlarging the Flowers, and giving them all thoſe ſickly or luxuriant Beauties which are ſo commonly to be met with in our Gardens. Some Notion they had of Managing *Dwarf-Trees*, and Clipping other Trees that would bear it into what Form the Gardeners pleaſe; but they ſpeak ſo little of it, that we have no reaſon to think they underſtood much of that beautiful Furniture which *Dwarfs* and *Ever-greens* afford us.

The Uſefulneſs of *Fruit-Trees* made them be anciently more regarded. The Vines and Olives of the Ancient *Greeks* and *Romans* we have mention'd alteady. They had ſeveral ſorts of Apples, Pears, Quinces, Peaches, Pomegranates, Plums, Figs and Nuts: As for Oranges and Limons, and the delicious Fruits of the *Eaſt* and *Weſt-Indies*, they were wholly Strangers to them. And they had not near the Variety of thoſe they knew, with which Monſieur *de la Quintinie*, were they now alive, cou'd furniſh them. Though they had many Precepts concerning Pruning, Setting, Graffing and Inoculating, knew their Uſefulneſs, and cou'd perform all thoſe Operations with Succeſs; yet, comparatively ſpeaking, their Manner was courſe; and had their Climates been as unkindly, their Succeſs wou'd have been

but

but indifferent. They could manage Earth and Air and Water pretty tolerably; but how to bring the Sun under Rules (if I may uſe ſo bold an Expreſſion) they knew not; which yet, by their Wall-Plantations, our Gardeners do every day. That is an Invention the Ancients were entirely unacquainted with; thereby, in Cold Countries, we can command the Warmth of *Italy* and *Spain*, and have Fruits of a Bigneſs, and Colour, and Taſte, which ev'n at Home they can ſcarce reach.

It will not be hard now, with due Allowances, to make a juſt Compariſon between *Ancient and Modern Horticulture*. Monſieur *de la Quintinie* will give us a full and juſt Idea of what the Skill of this Age can reach to: Mr. *Evelyn*'s *Kalendarium Hortenſe* ought to be joined with it, to ſhew the Difference in a more Northern Clime. What Variety our Floriſts can pretend to, will appear from *Parkinſon*'s *Paradiſe*, *Ferrarius*'s *Flora*, or *Swertius*'s *Florilegium*. In thoſe Books one may ſee what Art can do, to beautifie and enlarge Flowers beyond what Nature ordinarily produces. Other Men can only *follow* Nature; the Gardener alone *leads* it, and haſtens or ſlackens its pace according as ſuits beſt with his Deſigns or Inclinations.

I need

I need ſay nothing of the *Phyſic-Garden*; ſince what has been ſaid already in the foregoing Chapter enables every Man to judge there aright. So much for *the Knowledge of Things not endued with Senſible Life.*

[*Addit.* pag. 344. l. 15.]

SURGERY comes next to be conſidered; which though at preſent it be look'd upon as inferior to PHYSIC, yet it was much the ancienteſt, and is ſtill the certaineſt part of *Medicine*. For here the Eye directs the *Surgeon* how he ſhall proceed; and if he knows but the Virtue of his Medicines, and how to apply them, he can, generally ſpeaking, tell whether his Patient be curable or not. Anciently this was only a Branch of the *Phyſician*'s Work; and the Old *Phyſicians* in the Heroical Times, *Æſculapius*, *Chiron*, *Machaon*, and the reſt, were little more than *Surgeons* that could apply a Plaiſter, and cure a Green Wound. Nay, after Learning had emboldened Men to reaſon upon the Cauſes of Diſeaſes whoſe Original was not viſible to the naked Eye, and to try whether Inward Remedies would not cure them; *Surgery* was conſtantly treated of by *Phyſicians*,

ficians, as a part of their Profeſſion. *Celſus* alone will convince every Man of the truth of this Propoſition.

But how they treated of it, I durſt not adventure to aſſert; tho' the Public will thank me for leaving it untouch'd, ſince that eminently Learned Surgeon, Mr. *Charles Bernard*, who is ſo great an Honour to his Profeſſion, has done me the favour to communicate this following Paper: which I ſhall ſubjoin in his own words:

'If we enquire into the Improvements
'which have been made by the Moderns
'in *Surgery*, we ſhall be forced to confeſs,
'that we have ſo little reaſon to value our
'ſelves beyond the Ancients, or to be temp-
'ted to contemn them, as the faſhion is
'among thoſe who know little, and have
'read nothing, that we cannot give ſtrong-
'er or more convincing Proofs of our
'own Ignorance, as well as our Pride. I
'do not pretend that the Moderns have
'not at all contributed towards the Im-
'provement of *Surgery*; that were both
'abſurd and injurious, and would argue as
'much folly as that which I am reproach-
'ing: but that which I am conteſting for,
'is, That it conſiſts rather in Refining and
'Dreſſing up the Inventions of the An-
'cients, and ſetting them in a better Light,

'than

'than in Adding many important ones of
'our own. Whether it be, that the Art
'of Healing External Hurts, being princi-
'pally the Subject of our Senſes, was ear-
'lier ſtudied, and therefore capable of be-
'ing ſooner brought to a greater degree of
'Perfection, than the other branch of
'Medicine; or, that the majority of the
'meer Profeſſors having been for ſome
'Ages illiterate and empirical, it hath not
'been advanc'd and cultivated ſo as it might
'have been, had they been better qualify'd
'than they generally were, and do yet, for
'the greateſt part, continue to be: For a
'Teſtimony of which, that exceeding Pau-
'city of good Writers which occurr in *Sur-*
'*gery*, when compar'd with thoſe in moſt
'of the other learned Arts and Sciences,
'is, in my opinion, ſufficient; and yet,
'were they fewer, 'twould, in the judg-
'ment of theſe *Scioli*, be no great detri-
'ment to the Art. For the Folly of which
'Aſſertion, the beſt Excuſe that can be
'made, ſeems to be, that becauſe ſome
'Methods of proceeding both in *Phyſic* and
'*Surgery*, which are incommunicable, to
'which every Man muſt be directed by his
'own Judgment and Natural Sagacity, not
'being to be found in thoſe Authors whom
'theſe opinionated Practitioners have had
'the luck to conſult, they are led imme-
'diately

'diately to deſpiſe all Reading, as uſeleſs 'and uninſtructive; eſpecially that of the 'Ancients, who do not generally, I con-'feſs, write to Novitiates and Fools, or to 'thoſe who will be always ſuch.

'But whoever hath been converſant in 'their Writings, and hath the Opportunity 'and Capacity of comparing and judging 'from his own Experience, will readily con-'feſs, that one thing which does not a lit-'tle recommend the Reading of them be-'yond moſt of the Moderns, is, That they 'are more accurate in deſcribing the *Pathog-'nomonics*, and more juſt and nice in diſtin-'guiſhing the Species of Tumors and Ul-'cers, than our more refined Moderns are.

'If this Age hath par'd away any rude 'and ſuperfluous Methods of Practice, as 'it muſt be confeſs'd they have, it cannot 'be demonſtrated that they were all de-'riv'd from the Ancients, but were in a great 'meaſure introduc'd by ignorant and bar-'barous Profeſſors of a much later date.

'There is no queſtion, but that the prin-'cipal Improvements which have theſe lat-'ter Ages been made in *Surgery*, are owing 'chiefly to the Diſcoveries which have been 'made in *Anatomy*, by which we are better 'enabled to ſolve many of thoſe *Phænomena* 'which were before inexplicable, or ex-'plained amiſs; the moſt important part,

'in

'in the mean while (I mean the Art of 'Healing, to which all the others ought 'to be ſubſervient) remaining very little 'better than the Ancients left it.

'As an unconteſtable Proof of what I ſay, 'I appeal to all thoſe Bodies of *Surgery* 'which have been hitherto publiſh'd by 'the moſt Learned and Celebrated of the 'Moderns, being all manifeſtly Tranſcripts 'from one another, and the beſt of them 'from the Ancients. But this may indeed 'be ſaid in defence of the Moderns in this 'particular, That even Tranſcribing is not 'their Invention, tho' it be their Practice; 'for *Ætius* and *Ægineta* have borrow'd not 'a little of what they have, from *Galen*; and '*Marcellus Empiricus* more groſly from *Scri-* '*bonius Largus*, without ſo much as remem- 'bring his Name among the reſt of thoſe 'Authors to whom he was leſs beholden.

'Among all the Syſtematical Writers, I 'think there are very few who refuſe the 'Preference to *Hieron. Fabricius ab Aqua-* '*pendente*, as a Perſon of unqueſtion'd Lear- 'ning and Judgment; and yet is not he 'aſham'd to let his Readers know, that '*Celſus* among the Latins (who, he tells 'us, is *Mirabilis in Omnibus*, and adviſes, in '*Horace*'s words, *Nocturnâ verſare manu,* '*verſare diurnâ,*) *Paulus Ægineta* among 'the *Greeks*, and *Albuchaſis* among the

'*Ara-*

'*Arabians* (whom I am unwilling to place
'among the Moderns, being in the num-
'ber of thoſe whom our Modern Judges re-
'ject, either becauſe they never read him,
'or becauſe he had the misfortune to live
'$\overline{DC}$ Years ſince) are the Triumvirate to
'whom he principally ſtands indebted, for
'the Aſſiſtance he received from them, in
'compoſing his excellent Book.

'But how many Operations are there
'now in uſe, which were unknown to the
'Ancients? I fear, that upon a due En-
'quiry, there wou'd be more uſeful ones
'found to be omitted or diſcontinued, than
'to have been invented by us. But to de-
'ſcend a little to Particulars, that we may,
'without Prejudice or Partiality, be enabled
'to determine whether the Ancients are
'indeed ſo contemptible, and their Writings
'ſo uſeleſs, as ſome would repreſent them.

'*Cutting for the Stone* (to begin with that)
'was unqueſtionably theirs, and the man-
'ner accurately deſcribed by *Celſus* and
'others; and yet that no Perſon or Age
'may be defrauded of the Glory they de-
'ſerve, where we can do them right, we
'muſt confeſs, that that way of perform-
'ing it, which in moſt caſes is preferrible,
'and in ſome only practicable, which by
'Authors is ſtyl'd *Magnus Apparatus*, the
'High Operation, or *Cutting upon the Staff*,

'was

'was invented by one *Joannes de Romanis* 'of *Cremona*, who flouriſh'd at *Rome*, about 'the Year 1520. The Manner of the 'Operation, and the Inſtruments neceſſary, 'were firſt deſcribed and publiſh'd by his 'Scholar *Marianus Sanctus Barolitanus*, at '*Venice*, in 1535. The Uſe of the *Modiolus*, 'in Opening the Skull, was likewiſe theirs; 'our Country-man *Woodall* only mending 'the Inſtrument, by making that Taper, 'which was before Cylindrical, and for 'that reaſon not altogether ſo ſecure: The '*Alæ*, or Wings, being the Invention of that 'Great Man *Aquapendens*, to whom we 'ſtand obliged for many other uſeful In-'ſtruments. The *Paracenteſis*, in all its 'kinds, is theirs: *Barbette*, indeed, inven-'ted an Inſtrument which is ſometimes 'more commodiouſly made uſe of than the 'Ancient Methods are. *Laryngotomy*, or 'the *Opening of the Wind-Pipe*, in a Quinſey, 'was practis'd by them; an Operation 'ſecure and neceſſary; however, at this 'day ſo diſus'd, that it is almoſt become 'obſolete, either through the Timidity of 'the Patient, or Relations, or the Back-'wardneſs or Ignorance of the Phyſician or 'Surgeon; and tho' *Aretæus*, *P. Ægi-'neta*, and *Cælius Aurelianus*, ſeem, from 'the Authority of *Antyllus*, to diſcourſe 'doubtfully of it; yet the greateſt part

'of

'of the Ancients, both *Greeks* and *Ara-*
'*bians*, adviſe it; and *Galen* in particular,
'from Reaſon and Experience, as well as
'from the Authority of *Aſclepiades*, juſtly
'recommends it as the laſt Refuge in a
'Quinſey. *Cutting for the Hernia Inteſti-*
'*nalis*, with the true Diſtinctions and
'Cures of all the other Species, are accu-
'rately deſcribed by them. They taught
'us the Cure of the *Pterigion* and *Cataract*;
'they deſcribed and diſtinguiſh'd all the
'Diſeaſes of the Eyes, (which were not
'then, as now to the reproach of the
'Age they are, almoſt ſolely in the Hands
'of Old Women and Mountebanks) as
'juſtly as any of our Modern Oculiſts,
'who, indeed, do little more than tran-
'ſcribe from them. *Opening an Artery*,
'and the *Jugular-Vein*, (pretended to be
'revived here in *England*) was no more
'firſt attempted by the Moderns, than
'making *Ligature* in an *Aneuriſm*; which
'though an Operation of no mighty dif-
'ficulty, was certainly not underſtood,
'very lately, by *Fred. Ruyſch*, a conſide-
'rable *Dutch Anatomiſt*, and Profeſſor of
'that and Surgery at *Amſteldam*, [as may
'be ſeen in his *Obſervationes Anatomico-*
Chirurgicæ, Obſ. 2. printed in *Quarto*, at
'*Amſtel.* 1691.] The *Extirpation of the*
'*Tonſils*, or *Uvula*, is not our Invention;

[***] 'though

'though, indeed, the removal of the for-
'mer by *Potential Cauteries*, which we
'ſometimes uſe, when the Patient will
'not admit Exciſion or Fire, ſeems neither
'to have been practis'd nor known to the
'Ancients. The manner of treating the
'*Fiſtula Lachrymalis* (a nice and difficult
'Cure, very often) which we continue at
'this day, is no other than what was taught
'by them; only the Uſe of the *Cannula*
'for the *Cautery* ſeems owing to *Fabr. ab*
'*Aquapendente*. As for the *Actual Cautery*,
'no inconſiderable, however terrible a
'branch of *Surgery* it may ſeem, though
'*Coſtæus*, *Fienus* and *Severinus* have written
'ſo amply concerning it; yet from one
'ſingle Aphoriſm 'tis demonſtrable, that
'*Hippocrates* knew its true Uſe as well as
'any that have ſince ſucceeded him; not
'to mention how frequent it is in the
'Writings of all the reſt of the Ancients,
'and us'd in many caſes (I don't doubt
'but with admirable ſucceſs) wherein it is
'wholly neglected, or not underſtood by
'us. The Cure of the *Varices*, by Inci-
'ſion, ſcarce talk'd of in our days, ſeems
'to have been familiarly practis'd among
'the Ancients, as is manifeſt from *Celſus*,
'and *Paulus Ægineta*; though ſo painful
'an Operation, that, as *Tully* [2 *Tuſcul.*]
'and *Plutarch* tell us, *Marius* was the firſt
'who

'who in one Leg underwent it, ſtanding,
'and without being bound, though he
'cou'd not be prevail'd upon to purchaſe
'with ſo much Torture a Cure in the
'other: And though *Pliny* tells us, that
'he was *unus Hominum*, the ſingle Inſtance;
'yet *Tully* aſſures us, that by his Example,
'there were others that ſuſtain'd with e-
'qual Reſolution and Fortitude. And who-
'ever is converſant with thoſe obſtinate
'Varicous Ulcers which we frequently
'meet with, will confeſs, that for the ef-
'fecting of a Cure, 'tis abſolutely neceſ-
'ſary, however painful and ſuperfluous an
'Operation ſome may eſteem it. The
'Ancients mention the *Vari* and *Valgi*,
'and preſcribe us a Method of Cure; but
'the manner of their Reduction by the
'Inſtruments now in uſe they knew not,
'which were the Invention of *Fabricius*
'*ab Aquapendente*: as was alſo that for
'*Extraction of the Polypus*; which never-
'theleſs the Ancients cur'd as frequently,
'tho' not ſo commodiouſly as our ſelves.
'But the *Polypus of the Ear* (a Diſeaſe
'indeed which occurrs not ſo often as the
'preceding) ſeems ſo little known to the
'Moderns, that the very Mention of any
'ſuch Diſeaſe is rarely to be met with in
'any of their Writings, yet the Cure of it
'is not omitted by the Ancients. They

 'were

'were perfectly acquainted and furniſh'd
'with Convenient Inſtruments for the Re-
'duction of all the Species of *Fractures* and
'*Luxations*, and the Methods of treating
'them afterwards; together with all the
'kinds of *Sutures* at this day in uſe among
'us, and ſome too that are now loſt, at
'leaſt ſo uncertain, that ſome very learned
'Men have thought they employed not
'their time amiſs, in endeavouring to de-
'termine what they were, and to recover
'their Uſe. And though ſome have con-
'tended, that *Iſſues* were unknown to them,
'the contrary is evident from *Celſus* and
'*Cælius Aurelianus*; though we muſt ac-
'knowledge, that the placing and conti-
'nuing them as now we do, appears not
'to have been in uſe among them. Nor is
'the *Seton* ſo extremely Modern, but that
'*Lanfrancus*, who liv'd $\overline{CCCC}$ Years ſince,
'directs its Uſe, and deſcribes the manner
'of Making, (yet mentions it not as an
'Invention of his time,) though indeed, till
'*Hildanus*'s days, it ſeems to have been al-
'ways made with the *Actual Cautery*.

'There is no doubt but the Ὑστεροτο-
'μολονία, or *Cutting the Infant out of the*
'*Mother*, to preſerve both, commonly
'call'd *Partus Cæſareus*, (not often, if at
'all practis'd among us, tho' reviv'd by
'ſome of our Neighbours with a ſucceſs

'which

'which ought to provoke the Emulation 'of our Profeſſors here) is owing purely 'to the Felicity of the Moderns of the 'laſt Century. For, not to enter into the 'Controverſie, whether *Pliny*, *Nonius* or '*Iſidore* were in the right, in aſſerting, 'that the Firſt of the *Cæſars* was denomi-'nated from his manner of Birth; or '*Probus* and *Feſtus*, in affirming, that 'they were the *Cæſones*; whereas the '*Cæſars* were only ſo called, from their 'Hair: Moſt certain it is, that neither 'Side pretend the Operation to have been 'done *Matre Superſtite*: Nor is there any 'Evidence, that Cutting the *Fœtus* out 'of the Womb, and Preſerving the Mo-'ther, was ever propos'd or thought of by 'the Ancients, whether *Greek*, *Latine* or '*Arabian*; both the Story, and the Reaſon 'of the Name, being to be found only in 'the Hiſtorians and Grammarians. Who 'it was that firſt propos'd or practis'd it, 'I confeſs, I am not able to determine: 'For *Fr. Roſſetus*, who firſt wrote ſolemnly 'and expreſsly, or indeed at all, concern-'ing it, produces ſeveral Examples of other 'Men's Experience and Succeſs, before 'ever he attempted it himſelf.

'As for thoſe Operations which the *Greeks* 'call'd Κολοβώματα, or *Curtorum Chirurgia*, 'they amounted to no more than *Cutting*

 'the

'*the Hair-Lip*, or the like; for that they 'knew and practis'd; and therefore it be- 'comes us to do right to the Age whose 'it was, for the Discovery of that which '*Gaspar Taliacotius* properly so calls, and 'which himself brought to Perfection, 'and (whatever Scruples some who have 'not examin'd the History, may entertain 'concerning either the Truth or Possibility 'of the Fact) practis'd with wonderful 'Dexterity and Success, as may be prov'd 'from Authorities not to be contested. 'So that it is a most surprising thing to 'consider, that few or none should have 'since attempted to imitate so worthy 'and excellent a Pattern, especially in an 'Age wherein so many deplorable and 'scandalous Objects do every day seem 'either to beg or command our Assistance. 'But I do not assert him to have been the 'first Inventor, because it is what I find 'mention'd, tho' imperfectly, by *Alex. Benedictus*, before *Taliacotius* was born; 'and afterwards, by *Vesalius*, in his *Chi-* 'rurgia Magna, if at least that mean Piece 'be his, as we have it publish'd by *Bor-* 'garutius, which *Fabr. Hildanus* justly 'questions. There is likewise an Epistle 'quoted by *Steph. Gourmelenus*, in his 'Ars Chiurgica, written from one *Calen-* 'tius, to his Friend *Orpianus* (who, it seems,

'had

'had the misfortune to want a Noſe,) 'giving him an Account, that there was 'one *Brauca* a *Sicilian*, *qui didicit nares* '*inſerere*, which *Calentius* himſelf had ſeen 'perform'd, and therefore invites him to 'come, with this Encouragement, That 'he might be ſure to return with a Noſe 'of what ſize he pleas'd. Who this *Or-* '*pianus* was, is not material to enquire; 'nor can I, I confeſs, ſay much of this '*Brauca*, (or *Branca*, as *Taliacotius* calls 'him, who ſeems to know no more of 'Him or his Hiſtory, than what he tran- 'ſcrib'd from *Gourmelenus*; and *Gourme-* '*lenus* himſelf, no more than is expreſs'd 'in this Epiſtle of *Calentius*, which af- 'fords but little light into the Hiſtory;) 'though it is very probable that he was 'the ſame Perſon whom *Ambr. Parey* men- 'tions to have practis'd this way of 'Inoculating Noſes ſome Years before his 'time, in *Italy*; and gives an Inſtance of 'a Cadet of the Family *à S. Thoano*, who 'being weary and aſham'd of a Silver 'Noſe, applying himſelf to this *Italian*, 'return'd with one of Fleſh, to the Won- 'der and Satisfaction of all that knew 'him. As for this *Eliſius Calentius*, from 'whom we have the firſt mention, that I 'can find, of any ſuch Operation, he was 'Contemporary and Familiar with *San-*

 '*naza-*

'*nazarius*, and *Jov. Pontanus*, who men-
'tions him; as does alſo *Lilius Gyraldus*,
'in his *Hiſtory of the Modern Poets*, and
'tells us, agreeably enough, that he was
'Poor, Amorous, and a Poet; that he was
'born at *Amphracta*, in *Apulia*, but liv'd
'generally at *Naples*: His Works were
'printed about the Year 1503; and after-
'wards, his *Epiſtles*, among other ſelect
'ones, were publiſh'd by *Gilb. Cognatus*,
'and printed by *Oporinus*, in 1558. But
'I muſt not omit, among the reſt, (what
'indeed is ſo notorious, that no Man, I
'ſuppoſe, will deny it,) That all the ſorts
'of *Amputations*, as Limbs, and Breaſts, &c.
'were as familiarly practis'd among the
'Ancients, as any can pretend they are
'among us, if we had only the Authority
'of a Poet for it, *Immedicabile vulnus enſe*
'*reſcindendum eſt.*

'The Art of *Bandage*, or *Rowling*,
'no mean or unneceſſary, though neg-
'lected piece of *Surgery*, and upon which
'the *French* do ſo much value themſelves,
'they knew ſo well, and had in ſuch per-
'fection, that we have not pretended to
'add much to that excellent and uſeful
'Treatiſe which *Galen* hath expreſsly writ-
'ten upon that Subject.

'And tho' the Variety of *Inſtruments*
'now in uſe, may ſeem, in ſome meaſure,

'to

'to be juſtly challeng'd by the Moderns, 'every Man adding as his own Fancy ſug-'geſted, and the Neceſſity required; yet 'by what are tranſmitted to us by the An-'cients, 'tis notorious, that they were nei-'ther ignorant nor deſtitute of thoſe which 'were moſt neceſſary; and that they had 'Variety of others too, may, by what we 'ſee deſcrib'd by *Oribaſius* and others, and 'are at this day made uſe of, more eaſily 'be imagin'd than prov'd, but ſeems high-'ly probable.

'As for *Topical Medicines*, moſt cer-'tain it is that we are oblig'd to them, for 'inſtructing us in the Nature and Proper-'ties of almoſt all thoſe of which we do 'at this day form our Applications; ſome 'few excepted, the Productions of Mo-'dern Chymiſtry, in this or the preceding 'Century.

'And as for general Methods of Cure, 'many of them have been ſo excellently 'well handled by the Ancients, (to in-'ſtance only in Wounds of the Head) 'that ſeveral of the Moderns who have 'written moſt judiciouſly upon them, 'have been of Opinion, that they could 'not ſerve and oblige Poſterity better, 'than by Commenting upon that admi-'rable Book of *Hippocrates* upon the ſame 'Subject.

'That

'That which without Injury to the 'Ancients, or Vanity in our Selves, may 'be juſtly ſaid, is, That the publiſhing 'Obſervations after that Method which 'ſome of the Moderns have done, is that 'wherein we muſt be allowed infinitely 'to have exceeded them; and is vaſtly 'of more Advantage to the Reader, than 'the peruſal of tedious Syſtems are ca-'pable of being, two or three of which 'generally comprehending whatever is to 'be found in all the reſt: But particular 'Caſes, when judiciouſly and faithfully re-'ported, (of which, too few, I fear, even 'of the Moderns are guilty,) *Et prodeſſe 'ſolent & delectare*, are diverting and 'inſtructive at once, the Reader more ef-'fectually adding other Men's Experience 'to his own.

'But to inſiſt upon every Particular, 'and to pretend to demonſtrate what hath 'been Invented, Diſcontinued or Loſt in 'every Age, if it be to be done, requires 'a Perſon of greater Leiſure, and infi-'nitely more capable than my ſelf. What 'I have ſaid, is ſufficient to ſhew, that 'it becomes us to ſpeak of the Ancients 'with Reſpect and Civility at leaſt, if it 'were only for this; That it was our 'Inſtruction, and the Benefit of Mankind 'in general, which induc'd them to take

'that

'that Care, and to be at ſo much Expence 'of Time and Labour to communicate 'their Knowledge to the World: Not that 'we are implicitly to be be determin'd by 'their Authority, or to ſuppoſe that they 'have not left room for ſucceeding Ages 'to Invent, and to improve all thoſe Parts 'of *Surgery* wherein they appear either 'to have been miſtaken or dificient. For 'my own part, I muſt confeſs, I do en- 'tirely concurr with *Thomas Bartholine*, '[*Epiſt. Med.* Cent. 3.] who very well 'underſtood the Advantages which the 'Moderns had, and was himſelf as ſoli- 'citous for the Improvement of Know- 'ledge, as inquiſitive into Nature, and 'as happy in his Diſcoveries, as any of 'thoſe who imagine it a part of their 'Wit and Breeding to ridicule and con- 'temn the Ancients; *Peſſimè ſtudiis ſuis 'conſulunt* (ſays he) *qui ita recentiorum 'ſcriptis ſe immergunt, ut veteres vel neg- 'ligant vel contemnant, quam plerarumque 'rerum lux ex illis pendeat:* And in ano- 'ther place; *Ita ſemper recentiorum ſen- 'tentiis & opinionibus calculum adjeci, ut 'ſua antiquitati reverentia ſervaretur, cui 'artis noſtræ fundamenta debemus.*

[*Addit.*

[*Addit.* pag. xxii, &c.]

THE

POSTSCRIPT

TO THE

PREFACE.

SInce the *Second Edition* of my Book was printed off, we have had an Account in the *Journal des Sçavans*, that Monſieur *Perrault* has publiſh'd a THIRD PART of his *Parallel between the Ancients and the Moderns*; in which he undertakes to prove, that the Skill of the Moderns in *Geography*, *Philoſophy*, *Medicine*, *Mathematics*, *Navigation*, &c. is preferrible to that of the Ancients. The Book is not yet, that I know of, in *England*, and poſſibly may not be procurable in ſome time. I thought it neceſſary, however, to take notice, that I have had a bare Intimation of ſuch a Book, and no more; that ſo if in any Material Things we ſhould happen to Agree, (as writing upon the ſame Argument, 'tis very probable

bable we may,) I might not hereafter be thought a *Plagiary*. There was no danger hitherto; ſince as far as he had gone before, I either openly diſſented from him, or directly abridg'd his Words.

Pag. 220. I have, upon his own Authority given *Columbus* the Credit of Diſcovering that little Bone in the Inner Cavity of the Ear, which, from its figure, is commonly call'd the *Stirrup*: And indeed, he being the firſt that ever mention'd it in Print, and pretending that it was his own Invention, ſeems to have the faireſt Plea to the Honour of it. But *Philippus Ingraſſias*, who wrote ſome time before *Columbus*, certainly knew it: For, in his Commentary upon *Galen de Oſſibus*, he expreſsly mentions it; and for that Reaſon, *Falloppius*, who could not want Opportunity of being truly inform'd, and was a right honeſt Man, and a judicious Anatomiſt, and one to whom many Diſcoveries are owing, aſcribes it to him in ſuch Terms as put the Controverſie beyond diſpute. *Tertium* (ſays *Falloppius*, ſpeaking of the little Bones in the Inner Cavity of the Ear) *ſi nolumus debitâ laude quenquam defraudare, invenit & promulgavit primus Johannes Philippus ab Ingraſſia Siculus Philoſophus ac Medicus Doctiſſimus*

dum

dum Neapolitano in Gymnaſio publicè Anatomen doceret: And a little after; *Deus tamen glorioſus ſcit Ingraſſiæ fuiſſe inventum; atque cum Stapedis aut Saffæ noſtrorum Patrum effigiem geſtet, merito Stapedis nomine ab eodem fuiſſe donatum.* Had *Ingraſſias*'s Book been printed in his Lifetime, there had never been room for a Diſpute; though his Right was ſo well known, that *Bartholomæus Euſtachius*, who wrote ſoon after *Columbus*, and put in his Claim to the Glory of the Diſcovery, mentions *Ingraſſias*'s Pretences, which *Columbus* does not.

Some, perhaps, will think this Enquiry into the Author of this Diſcovery, to be a needleſs Affectation of Exactneſs. But 'tis ſo much the Duty of all Writers, not to miſ-lead their Readers in the ſmalleſt particular, that they are obliged to rectifie their own Miſtakes where-ever they find them, and not to be afraid of being accuſed of Negligence; ſince Truth, and not Glory, ought to be the ultimate End of all our Labours and Enquiries.

I am obliged alſo to take notice, that I have lately got a ſight of *Servetus*'s *Chriſtianiſmi Reſtitutio*, out of which that famous paſſage concerning the *Circulation*

of

of the Blood, which I ſet down at length, *pag.* 230. was copied long ago by that worthy Member of the *Royal Society*, Mr. *Abraham Hill*, from whom Mr. *Bernard* had it. My Lord Biſhop of *Norwich*, whoſe incomparable Library contains every thing that is rare and excellent, did me the Honour to ſhow it me. His Manuſcript Copy is a Tranſcript of that Printed one which is preſerved in the Landtgrave of *Heſſe*'s Library at *Caſſels*; the very Book that was peruſed by *Sandius*, who gives an Account of it in his *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*. The Book it ſelf was printed (at *Baſil*, ſays *Sandius*) in 1553. and is a Collection of all *Servetus*'s *Theological Tracts*, though conſiderably enlarged: ſome of which, and particularly his *Diſcourſes concerning the Trinity*, had been publiſh'd Twenty Years before. This I mention; becauſe, if what *Servetus* ſays of the Paſſage of the Blood through the Lungs, be in the former Edition, the Diſcovery has ſo much the greater Antiquity. The Paſſages now in queſtion, are in the *Fifth Book of the Trinity*, where he treats of the *Holy Ghoſt*: There he takes pains to prove, (*a*) that

(*a*) He ſays he introduces this Diſputation, *ut inde intelligas ipſi Spiritûs Sancti Subſtantiæ eſſe eſſentialiter adjunctam creati Spiritûs Chriſti Subſtantiam.*

the

the *Subſtance of the Created Spirit of Jeſus Chriſt is Eſſentially joined to the Subſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.* To explain this, he talks much of God's Breathing the Soul into Man, which, by his manner of Explication, it is plain, he believed to be Material, the way he proceeds, is this: 'He ſuppoſes Three Spirits in Man's Body, '*Natural*, *Vital*, and *Animal*; 'which (ſays he) are (*b*) really not Three, but Two diſtinct Spirits. The *Vital* is 'that which is communicated 'by *Anaſtomoſes* from the Arteries to the Veins, in which 'it is called *Natural*. The '*Blood* therefore is *Firſt*, whoſe 'Seat is in the Liver and Veins: 'The *Vital Spirit* is *Second*, 'whoſe Seat is in the Heart 'and Arteries: The *Animal* '*Spirit* is *Third*, which is like a Ray of 'Light, and has its Seat in the Brain and 'Nerves.' So that he makes the beginning of the whole Operation to be in the Liver; which, according to him, is the original Work-houſe of the Blood, which he calls the *Soul* or *Life*, as it is call'd in the Old Teſtament.

(*b*) *Qui vere non ſunt tres, ſed duo Spiritus diſtincti. Vitalis eſt ſpiritus qui per Anaſtomoſes ab Arteriis communicatur Venis, in quibus dicitur Naturalis. Primus ergo eſt Sanguis, cujus ſedes eſt in hepate & corporis venis: Secundus eſt Spiritus Vitalis, cujus ſedes eſt in corde, & corporis arteriis: Tertius eſt Spiritus Animalis, quaſi lucis radius, cujus ſedes eſt in cerebro & corporis nervis.*

Now

Now to underſtand how the *Blood* is the Life, he ſays, (c) 'We 'muſt firſt underſtand the 'ſubſtantial Generation of 'the Vital Spirit, which is 'compounded of, and nou-'riſhed by Inſpired Air, and 'the ſubtileſt part of the 'Blood: The *Vital Spirit* has 'its original in the left Ven-'tricle of the Heart, by the aſ-'ſiſtance of the Lungs, which 'chiefly contribute to its Ge-'neration. It is a *ſubtile* Spi-'rit (ſo I render *tenuis* here) 'wrought by the force of 'Heat; of a florid Colour, 'having the power of Fire: 'ſo that it is a ſort of ſhi-

(c) *Ad quam rem eſt prius intelligenda ſubſtantialis Generatio ipſius Vitalis Spiritûs, qui ex Aëre inſpirato & ſubtiliſſimo ſanguine componitur & nutritur: Vitalis ſpiritus in ſiniſtro cordis ventriculo ſuam originem habet, juvantibus maxime pulmonibus ad ipſius generationem. Eſt ſpiritus tenuis, caloris vi elaboratus, flavo colore, igneâ potentiâ, ut ſit quaſi ex puriore ſanguine lucens vapor, ſubſtantiam continens aquæ, aëris & ignis: generatur ex factâ in pulmone mixtione inſpirati aëris cum elaborato ſubtili ſanguine, quem dexter ventriculus ſiniſtro communicat. Fit autem communicatio hæc non per parietem cordis medium, ut vulgo creditur, ſed magno artificio à dextro cordis ventriculo longo per pulmones ductu, agitatur ſanguis ſubtilis: à pulmonibus præparatur, flavus efficitur, & à venâ arteriosâ in arteriam venoſam transfunditur; deinde in ipsâ arteriâ venosâ inſpirato aëri miſcetur, & exſpiratione à fuligine repurgatur: atque ita tandem à ſiniſtro cordis ventriculo totum mixtum per Diaſtolen attrahitur, apta ſupellex ut fiat ſpiritus vitalis.*

Quod ita per pulmones fiat communicatio & præparatio, docet conjunctio varia & communicatio venæ arterioſæ cum arteriâ venosâ in pulmonibus. Confirmat hoc magnitudo inſignis venæ arterioſæ, quæ nec talis nec tanta facta eſſet, nec tantam à corde ipſo vim puriſſimi ſanguinis in pulmones emitteret ob ſolum eorum nutrimentum, nec cor pulmonibus hac ratione ſerviret, cum præſertim antea in embryone ſolerent pulmones ipſi aliunde nutriri ob membranulas ſeu ——— Cordis uſque ad horam nativitatis nondum apertas, ut docet Galenus.

'ning

'ning Vapour made of the purer part 'of the Blood, containing within it ſelf 'the ſubſtance of Water, Air and Fire. 'It is made in the Lungs, by the mix-'ture of Inſpired Air with that Elaborated 'Subtile Blood which the Right Ventricle 'of the Heart communicates to the Left. 'Now this Communication is not made 'through the *Septum* of the Heart, as is 'commonly believed, but the ſubtile Blood 'is very artificially agitated by a long 'paſſage through the Lungs from the 'right Ventricle of the Heart, and is pre-'pared, made florid by the Lungs, and 'transfuſed out of the *Arterious Vein* into 'the *Venous Artery*, and at laſt in the *Ve-'nous Artery* it ſelf it is mixed with the 'Inſpired Air, and by expiration purged 'from its Dregs. And thus at length the 'whole Mixture is attracted, by the *Dia-'ſtole* of the Heart, into the left Ventricle, 'being now a fit Subſtance out of which 'to form the Vital Spirit.

'Now that this Communication and 'Preparation is made by the Lungs, is 'evident from the various Conjunction 'and Communication of the *Arterious 'Vein* with the *Venous Artery* in the Lungs; 'the remarkable largeneſs of the *Arterious 'Vein* does likewiſe confirm it: ſince it

'would

'would never have been made of that 'Form and Bulk, nor would it have 'emitted so great a quantity of very pure 'Blood out of the Heart into the Lungs, 'if it had been only for their Nourish-'ment: nor would the Heart have 'been this way serviceable to the Lungs, 'since the *Fœtus* in the Womb are other-'wise nourished, by reason of the close-'ness of the Membranes of the Heart, 'which are never open'd till the Birth of 'the Child, as *Galen* teaches.' So that the whole Mixture of Fire and Blood is made in the Lungs, where there is a (*d*) 'Transfusion out of the *Arterious Vein* 'into the *Venous Artery*, which *Galen* took 'no notice of.

(*d*) *Transfusio à venâ arteriosâ ad arteriam venosam propter spiritum, à Galeno non animadversa.*

Afterwards, he says, (*e*) 'That this '*Vital Spirit* is transmitted from the 'left Ventricle of the Heart into the 'Arteries of the whole Body; so that the 'more subtile Parts get upwards, where 'they are yet more refined, especially in 'the *Plexus Retiformis*, which lies in the

(*e*) *Ille itaque spiritus vitalis à sinistro cordis ventriculo in arterias totius corporis deinde transfunditur, ita ut qui tenuior est, superiora petat, ubi magis adhuc elaboratur, præcipue in plexu retiformi sub basi cerebri sito, ubi ex vitali fieri incipit animalis ad propriam rationalis animæ rationem accedens.*

 'Base

'Baſe of the Brain, where, from *Vital*, 'it begins to become *Animal*, and ap- 'proaches to the proper Nature of the 'Rational Soul.'

This he reaſons long upon, to prove, that the Blood is the Soul of Man; and ſeems to allow no other but what is thus made; firſt elaborated in the Liver, thence carried by the Veins into the right Ventricle of the Heart, and ſo into the Lungs; where being mix'd with Air, it becomes Vital; and afterwards being carried by the Arteries into the Brain, it is there further ſublimed, till it receives its laſt Perfection, ſo as to be fit to perform the nobleſt Operations of the Animal Life.

If we compare now this Notion thus explained by *Servetus*, with Dr. *Harvey*'s *Theory of the Circulation of the Blood*, we ſhall plainly ſee, that he had imperfect Glimmerings of that Light which afterwards Dr. *Harvey* communicated with ſo bright a Luſtre to the learned World: Which Glimmerings, ſince they were ſo true, having nothing in them of a Falſe-Fire, I much wonder that he went no further; though at the ſame time I cannot but heartily congratulate the Felicity of my own Countrey, which produced

the

the Man that first saw the Importance of these noble Hints which he improved into a *Theory*, and thereby made them truly useful to Mankind.

Before I conclude this POSTSCRIPT, it will be expected, perhaps, that I should say something concerning this *New Edition*. I have taken the Liberty which all Men have ever allowed, to Alter and Add where I thought any thing was faulty or deficient, and now and then I omitted some few Passages that did not so immediately relate to the design of the Book.

By one of these *Additions*, that of *Surgery*, which Mr. *Bernard* put in at my request, it will be yet further seen, that I would have nothing allowed to the Moderns, where the Cause will not strictly bear it. I had conceded so much to them before, that it was generally thought I was biass'd on their behalf: It was not enough, to tell the World I was of no Side; the contrary was taken for granted, since in so many Particulars I actually gave them the Pre-eminence, when Sir *W. T.* had given it them almost in nothing. I must own, I was glad it could be proved, that the World has not actually lost its Vigour,

Vigour, but that a gradual Improvement is plainly visible; which this Instance that Mr. *Bernard* has so incontestably made out, does by no means contradict. For *Surgery*, though it is the certainest, yet it is the simplest part of *Medicine*: There the Operator is more let into his Work, which does not depend so much upon Conjecture as *Physic*. The Reproach therefore of its comparatively small Proficiency, is to be laid upon the *Men*, not the *Art*; it has been for these last Ages esteemed too Mechanical for Men of Liberal Education, and fine Parts, to busie themselves about: So that I question not but if as many learned Men had cultivated *Surgery* for these last $\overline{CCC}$ Years, as have employed themselves in some other Parts of Natural and Mathematical Learning, it would have met with as proportionable an Encrease; unless we should say, that it is already come to its highest Perfection; which, whether it be or no, I cannot pretend to decide.

The *entire* Discourses which are added, are printed by themselves, for the Satisfaction of those who have bought the *First Edition*, and have no Curiosity to compare that with the *Second*. But I have not re-printed those *lesser* Additions which

are

are interwoven into the Body of the Book, both becauſe they would appear only like a parcel of looſe Scraps, and becauſe ſomething was to be done in compliance to the Bookſeller, who (having once more, at a time when Printing labours under ſo great Diſcouragements, adventur'd to publiſh ſo large a Book which ſo few People will care to read) deſired that this *Second Edition* might be made as Valuable to him as well it cou'd.

April 30.
1697.

A DISSERTATION UPON THE EPISTLES OF PHALARIS, THEMISTOCLES, SOCRATES, EURIPIDES, and Others; And the FABLES of ÆSOP.

BY
RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D.
Chaplain in Ordinary and Library-keeper to His MAJESTY.

LONDON, Printed by *J. Leake*, for *Peter Buck*, at the Sign of the *Temple*, near the *Inner-Temple-Gate*, in *Fleet-Street*, MDCXCVII.

Sir William Temple's Eſſay upon Ancient and Modern Learning, *pag.* 58.

IT may perhaps be further affirmed, in favour of the Ancients; That the oldeſt Books we have, are ſtill in their kind the beſt. The two moſt Ancient that I know of in Proſe, among thoſe we call Profane Authors, are Æſop's *Fables, and* Phalaris's *Epiſtles, both living near the ſame time, which was that of* Cyrus *and* Pythagoras. *As the firſt has been agreed by all Ages ſince for the greateſt Maſter in his kind; and all others of that ſort have been but Imitations of his Original: ſo I think the Epiſtles of* Phalaris *to have more Race, more Spirit, more Force of Wit and Genius, than any others I have ever ſeen either Ancient or Modern. I know, ſeveral Learned Men (or that uſually paſs for ſuch, under the Name of Critics) have not eſteemed them Genuine; and* Politian, *with ſome others, have attributed them to* Lucian: *but I think he muſt have little Skill in Painting, that cannot find out this to be an Original. Such Diverſity of Paſſions, upon ſuch Variety of Actions and Paſſages of Life and Government; ſuch Freedom of Thought, ſuch Boldneſs*

neſs of Expreſſion; ſuch Bounty to his Friends, ſuch Scorn of his Enemies; ſuch Honour of Learned Men, ſuch Eſteem of Good; ſuch Knowledge of Life, ſuch Contempt of Death; with ſuch Fierceneſs of Nature, and Cruelty of Revenge, could never be repreſented but by him that poſſeſſed them. And I eſteem Lucian *to have been no more capable of Writing, than of Acting what* Phalaris *did. In all One writ, you find the Scholar or the Sophiſt; and all, the Other, the Tyrant and the Commander.*

A DIS-

A DISSERTATION UPON The EPISTLES of PHALARIS, and others; and the FABLES of ÆSOP.

To Mr. Wotton.

SIR,

I Remember, that diſcourſing with you upon this Paſſage of Sir *W. T.* (which I have here ſet down,) I happen'd to ſay, That with all Deference to ſo great an Authority, and under a juſt Awe of ſo ſharp a Cenſure, I believed it might be even demonſtrated, that the *Epiſtles* of *Phalaris* are Spurious,

and that we have nothing now extant of *Æſop*'s own Compoſing. This caſual Declaration of my Opinion, by the power of that long Friendſhip that has been between us, you improved into a Promiſe, That I would ſend you my Reaſons in Writing, to be added to the New Edition of your Book: believing it, as I ſuppoſe, a conſiderable Point in the Controverſie you are engaged in. For if it once be made out, that thoſe Writings your Adverſary ſo extolls, are Suppoſititious, and of no very long Standing; you have then His and his Parties own Confeſſion, That ſome of the Later Pens have outdone the Old ones in their kinds: And to others, that have but a mean Eſteem of the Wit and Stile of thoſe Books, it will be a double Prejudice againſt him, in your favour, That he could neither diſcover the true Time, nor the true Value of his Authors.

Theſe, I imagine, were your Thoughts; when you engaged me to this, that I am now doing. But I muſt take the freedom to profeſs, that I write without any view or regard to your Controverſie; which I do not make my own, nor preſume to interpoſe in it. 'Tis a Subject ſo nice and delicate, and of ſuch a mixed and diffuſed nature, that I am content to make the beſt

best Use I can of both Ancients and Moderns, without venturing with you, upon the hazard of a wrong Comparison, or the envy of a true one.

That *some of the Oldest Books are the best in their kinds*, the same Person having the double Glory of Invention and Perfection; is a thing observed even by some of the Ancients (*a*). But then the Authors they gave this Honour to, are *Homer* and *Archilochus*, one the Father of Heroic Poem, and the other of Epode and Trochaic. But the choice of *Phalaris* and *Æsop*, as they are now extant, for the two great inimitable Originals, is a piece of Criticism of a peculiar Complexion, and must proceed from a Singularity of Palate and Judgment.

(*a*) *Dion. Chrysost.* Orat. 33. p. 397.

To pass a Censure upon all kinds of Writings, to shew their several Excellencies and Defects, and especially to assign each of them to their proper Authors, was the chief Province and the greatest Commendation of the Ancient Critics. And it appears from those Remains of Antiquity that are left us, that they never wanted Employment. For to forge and counterfeit Books, and father them upon Great Names, has been a Practice almost as old as Letters. But it was then most of all in fashion, when

(*b*) *Galen. in Hippoc. de Natura Hominis*, Comm. 2. p. 17. Ed. *Baſil.*

the (*b*) Kings of *Pergamus* and *Alexandria*, rivalling one another in the Magnificence and Copiouſneſs of their Libraries, gave great rates for any Treatiſes that carried the names of celebrated Authors. Which was an Invitation to the Scribes and Copyers of thoſe Times, to enhance the Price of their Wares by aſcribing them to Men of Fame and Reputation; and to ſuppreſs the true Names, that would have yielded leſs Money. And now and then even an Author, that wrote for Bread, and made a Traffic of his Labours, would purpoſely conceal himſelf, and perſonate ſome old Writer of eminent Note; giving the Title and Credit of his Works to the Dead, that himſelf might the better live by them. But what was then done chiefly for Lucre, was afterwards done out of Glory and Affectation, as an Exerciſe of Stile, and an Oſtentation of Wit. In this the Tribe of the Sophiſts are principally concerned; in whoſe Schools it was the ordinary task to compoſe Ἠθοποιίας, to make Speeches and write Letters in the Name and Character of ſome Heroe, or great Commander or Philoſopher; Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους, *What would* Achilles, Medea, *or* Alexander *ſay in ſuch or ſuch Circumſtances?* Thus *Ovid*, we ſee, who was bred up in that way, writ Love Letters

in

in the Names of *Penelope* and the reſt. 'Tis true, they came abroad under his own Name; becauſe they were written in *Latin* and in Verſe, and ſo had no colour or pretence to be the Originals of the *Græcian* Ladies. But ſome of the *Greek* Sophiſts had the Succeſs and Satisfaction to ſee their Eſſays in that kind paſs with ſome Readers for the genuine Works of thoſe they endeavoured to expreſs. This, no doubt, was great Content and Joy to them; being as full a Teſtimony of their Skill in Imitation; as the Birds gave to the Painter, when they peck'd at his Grapes. One of them (*c*) indeed, has dealt ingenuouſly, and confeſs'd that he feign'd the Anſwers to *Brutus*, only as a Trial of Skill: but moſt of them took the other way, and concealing their own Names, put off their Copies for Originals; preferring that ſilent Pride and fraudulent Pleaſure, though it was to die with them, before an honeſt Commendation from Poſterity for being good Imitators. And to ſpeak freely, the greateſt part of Mankind are ſo eaſily impoſed on in this way, that there is too great Invitation to put the trick upon them. What clumſie Cheats, thoſe *Sibylline* Oracles now extant, and *Ariſteas*'s Story of the *Septuagint*, paſſed without controul even among very learned Men.

(*c*) *Miſerdatus Præf. Epiſt. Bruti.*

And

And even ſome Modern Attempts of this kind have met with Succeſs not altogether diſcouraging. For though *Annius* of *Viterbo*, after a Reputation of ſome Years, and *Inghiramius* immediately, were ſhamed out of all Credit: yet *Sigonius*'s Eſſay *de Conſolatione*, as coming from a skilful Hand, may perhaps paſs for *Cicero*'s with ſome, as long as *Cicero* himſelf ſhall laſt. Which I cannot preſage of that bungling Supplement to *Petronius* (I mean not that from *Traw*, but the pretended one from *Buda*) that Scandal to all Forgeries: though, I hear, 'tis at preſent admired as a genuine Piece by ſome that think themſelves no ordinary Judges.

O F

OF PHALARIS's EPISTLES.

THat Sophiſt, whoever he was, that wrote a ſmall Book of Letters in the Name and Character of *Phalaris*, (give me leave to ſay this now, which I ſhall prove by and by) had not ſo bad a hand at Humouring and Perſonating, but that ſeveral believed, it was the Tyrant himſelf that talked ſo big, and could not diſcover the Aſs under the Skin of that Lion. For we find *Stobæus* (*d*), quoting the 38, and 67, and 72, of thoſe *Epiſtles*, under the Title of *Phalaris*. And *Suidas*, in the Account he gives of him, ſays he has wrote *moſt admirable Letters*, ἐπιſτολὰς θαυμαſίας πάνυ, meaning thoſe that we are ſpeaking of. And *Johannes Tzetzes*, a Man of much rambling Learning, has many and large Extracts out of them, in his *Chiliads*; aſcribing them all to the Tyrant whoſe Livery they wear. Theſe three, I think, are the only Men among the Ancients, that make any mention of them: but ſince they give not the leaſt hint of any Doubts concerning their Author; we may conclude, that all the

(*d*) *Stob.* Tit. vii.

Scholars

Scholars of thoſe Ages received them as true Originals; ſo that they have the general Warrant and Certificate for this laſt Thouſand Years before the Reſtoration of Learning. As for the Moderns; beſides the Approbation of thoſe ſmaller Critics, that have been concerned in the Editions of them, and cry them up of courſe; ſome very Learned Men have eſpouſed and maintained them, ſuch as *Thomas Fazellus* (e), and *Jacobus Cappellus* (f). Even Mr. *Selden* himſelf (g) draws an Argument in Chronology from them, without diſcovering any Suſpicion or Jealouſie of a Cheat. To whom I may add their lateſt and greateſt Advocate; who has honoured them with that moſt high Character, prefixt to this Treatiſe.

(e) *Hiſtoria Sicula*, P. 118.
(f) *Hiſtoria Sacra & Exotica*, P. 249.
(g) *Marm. Arundel.* P. 106.

Others, indeed, have ſhewn their Diſtruſt of *Phalaris*'s Title to them; but are content to declare their Sentiment without aſſigning their Reaſons. *Phalaris, or ſome body elſe,* [ſays *Cælius Rhod.* lib. iii. c. 7.] *The Epiſtles that go under the Name of Phalaris,* [*Menagius* ad *Laert.* p. 35.] Some name the very Perſon, at whoſe door they lay the Forgery. *Lucian, whom they commonly miſtake for Phalaris,* [ſays *Ang. Politianus*, Epiſt. 1.] *The Epiſtles of Phalaris, if they are truly his, and not rather Lucians,* [*Lilius Greg. Gyraldus, Poet. Hiſt.*

Hiſt. p.88.] who, in another place, [*p.*332.] informs us, that *Politian*'s Opinion had generally obtained among the Learned of that Age: *The Epiſtles*, ſays he, *of Phalaris, which moſt People attribute to Lucian.* How judiciouſly they aſcribe them to *Lucian*, we ſhall ſee better anon; after I have examin'd the Caſe of *Phalaris*, who has the Plea and Right of Poſſeſſion. And I ſhall not go to diſpoſſeſs him, as thoſe have done before me, by an Arbitrary Sentence in his own Tyrannical Way; but proceed with him upon lawful Evidence, and a fair, impartial Trial. And I am very much miſtaken in the Nature and Force of my Proofs, if ever any Man hereafter, that reads them, perſiſt in his old Opinion of making *Phalaris* an Author.

The Cenſures that are made from Stile and Language alone, are commonly nice and uncertain, and depend upon ſlender Notices. Some very ſagacious and learned Men have been deceived in thoſe Conjectures, even to ridicule. The great *Scaliger* publiſhed a few Iambics, as a choice Fragment of an old Tragedian, given him by *Muretus*; who ſoon after confeſs'd the Jeſt, that they were made by himſelf. *Boxhornius* writ a Commentary upon a ſmall Poem *De Lite*, ſuppoſed by him to be ſome ancient

ancient Author's; but it was ſoon diſcover'd to be *Michael Hoſpitalius*'s, a late Chancellor of *France*. So that if I had no other Argument, but the Stile, to detect the Spuriouſneſs of *Phalaris*'s *Epiſtles*; I my ſelf, indeed, ſhould be ſatisfied with that alone, but I durſt not hope to convince every body elſe. I ſhall begin therefore with another ſort of Proofs, that will affect the moſt ſlow Judgments, and aſſure the moſt timid or incredulous.

The Time of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny cannot be preciſely determined, ſo various and defective are the Accounts of thoſe that write of him. *Euſebius* ſets the Beginning of it Olymp. XXXI, 2. *Phalaris apud Agrigentinos tyrannidem exercet*; and the End of it Olymp. XXXVII, 2. *Phalaridis tyrannis deſtructa.* By which Reckoning he governed XXVIII Years. But St. *Hierom*, out of ſome unknown Chronologer (for that Note is not extant in the *Greek* of *Euſebius*) gives a different Time of his Reign, above LXXX Years later than the other; Olymp. LIII, 3. or as other Copies read it, LII, 2. *Phalaris tyrannidem exercuit annos* XVI. Which is agreeable to *Suidas*, who places him, κατὰ τ̃ν νβ. ὀλυμπάδα, about the LII Olympiad. If the former Account be admitted, the Cheat is manifeſt at firſt ſight:

ſight : for thoſe Letters of *Phalaris* to *Steſichorus* and *Pythagoras* muſt of neceſſity be falſe. Becauſe *Steſichorus* was but VI Years old at that ſuppoſed time of *Phalaris*'s Death ; and *Pythagoras* was not taken notice of in *Greece* till LXXX Years after it. But for the ſake of *Ariſtotle* and *Jamblichus*, who make theſe Three to be Contemporaries, and that I may prevent all poſſible Cavils and Exceptions ; I am willing to allow the latter Account, the more favourable to the pretended Letters ; his Government commencing Olymp. LIII, 3. and expiring after XVI Years, Olymp. LVII, 3.

I. In the laſt Epiſtle, to thoſe of *Enna*, a City of *Sicily* ; *Phalaris* ſays, the *Hyblenſes* and *Phintienſes* had promiſed to lend him Money at Intereſt ; Οἱ ὑπέσχηντο δανείσειν, ὡς Ὑβλαίοι καὶ Φιντιεῖς. The Sophiſt was careful to mention ſuch Cities as he knew were in *Sicily*. For ſo *Ptolemee* places Φιντία there ; and *Antoninus*, *Phintis* ; and *Pliny*, *Phintienſes*. But it is ill luck for this Forger of Letters, that a Fragment of (*h*) *Diodorus*, a *Sicilian*, and well acquainted with the Hiſtory of his Countrey, was preſerved to be a Witneſs againſt him. That excellent Writer informs us, that *Phintias*, Tyrant of *Agrigentum*, (the very Place where *Phalaris* was before

(*h*) *Diod.* p. 867.

fore him) firſt built *Phintia*, calling it by his own Name; Κτίζει δὲ Φιντίας πόλιν, ἐνομάσας αὐτὴν Φιντιάδα· and that this was done, while the *Romans* were at War with King *Pyrrhus*, that is, Olymp. CXXV; which is above CCLXX Years after *Phalaris*'s Death, taking even the later Account of St. *Hierom*. A pretty Slip this of our Sophiſt, who, like the reſt of his Profeſſion, was more vers'd in the Books of Orators than Hiſtorians, to introduce his Tyrant borrowing Money of a City, almoſt CCC Years before it was named or built.

II. In the XCII Epiſtle, he threatens *Steſichorus* the Poet, for raiſing Money and Soldiers againſt him at *Aluntium* and *Alæſa*, ἢ εἰς Ἀλόντιον ἢ εἰς Ἀλαισαν: and that perhaps he might be ſnapt, before he got home again from *Alæſa* to *Himera*, ἐξ Ἀλαίσης εἰς Ἰμέραν. What a pity 'tis again, that the Sophiſt had not read *Diodorus*: for he would have told him, that this *Alæſa* was not in being in *Phalaris*'s days. (*i*) It was firſt built by *Archonides*, a *Sicilian*, Olymp. XCIV, 2. or, as others ſay, by the *Carthaginians*, about Two Years before. So that here are above CXX Years ſlipt, ſince the lateſt period of *Phalaris*. And we muſt add above a dozen more to the reckoning, upon the Sophiſt's own

(*i*) *Diod.* P. 246.

own ſcore: For this Letter is ſuppoſed to bear date before *Steſichorus* and *Phalaris* were made Friends; which was a dozen Years, as he tells his Tale (*k*), before *Steſichorus* died; and *Phalaris* he makes to ſurvive him. I am aware, that the ſame Author ſays, (*l*) that there were other Cities in *Sicily*, called *Alæſa*: But it is evident from the ſituation, that this *Alæſa* of *Archonides* is meant in the Epiſtles; for this lies on the ſame Coaſt with *Himera* and *Aluntium*, (to which two the Sophiſt here joins it,) and is at a ſmall diſtance from them. And indeed there was no other Town of that name in the days of the Sophiſt, the reſt being ruin'd long before.

(*k*) *Epiſt.* 103.

(*l*) *Diod.* ibid.

III. The LXX Epiſtle gives an account of ſeveral rich Preſents to *Polyclitus* the *Meſſenian* Phyſician, for doing a great cure upon *Phalaris*. Among the reſt, he names ποτηρίων Θηρικλείων ζεύγη δέκα, *ten couple of Thericlean cups*. But there is another thing, beſides a pretty Invention, very uſeful to a Lyar; and that is, a good Memory. For we will ſuppoſe our Author to have once known ſomething of theſe Cups, the time and the reaſon they were firſt called ſo; but that he had unhappily forgot it, when he writ this Epiſtle. They were large Drinking-Cups, of a peculiar

ſhape, ſo called from the firſt Contriver of them, one *Thericles* a *Corinthian* Potter. *Pliny*, by miſtaking his Author *Theophraſtus*, makes him a Turner, [lib. XVI. cap. 40.] *Celebratur & Thericles nomine, calices ex terebintho ſolitus facere torno.* The words of *Theophraſtus* are theſe, [*Hiſt. Plant.* l. v. cap. 4.] τορνεύεσθαι δ' ἐξ αὐτῆς (τερμίνθου) κύλικας Θηρικλείους, ὥστε μηδ' ἂν ἕνα διαγνῶναι πρὸς τὰς κεραμέας; *That the Turners make* Thericlean *Cups of the Turpentine tree, which cannot be diſtinguiſhed from thoſe made by the Potters.* Here can nothing be gathered hence, to make *Thericles* himſelf a Turner; for after he had firſt invented them, they were called *Thericlean*, from their ſhape, whatſoever Artificer made them, and whether of Earth, or of Wood, or of Metal. But as I ſaid, by the general conſent of Writers, we muſt call him a Potter. *Heſychius*, Θηρίκλειος, κύλιξ εἶδος, ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους κεραμέως. *Lucian* [in *Lexiphanes*, pag. 960.] Καὶ γυναικὶ πολλὰ, οἷα Θηρικλῆς ὤπλα. *Etymologicon M.* Θηρίκλειον κύλικα, ἣν λέγουσι, πρῶτος κεραμεὺς Θηρικλῆς ἐποίησεν, ὡς φησιν Εὔβουλος, ὁ τῆς μέσης Κωμῳδίας ποιητής. The words of *Eubulus*, whom he cites, are extant in *Athenæus*, [lib. XI. p. 471.]

Καθαρώτερον γὰρ ἢ κέραμον εἰργαζόμην,
Ἡ Θηρικλῆς τὰς κύλικας, πρίν' ἦν νέος.

And

And again;

Ω γαῖα μεγαμῖτ', ἥ σε Θηεικλῆς ποτε
Ετεύξε, κοίλης λαγόνος εὐρύνας βάθος.

Now the next thing to be enquired, is the Age of this *Thericles*; and we learn that from *Athenæus*; one Witneſs indeed, but as good as a multitude in a matter of this nature, [*pag.* 470.] Κατασκευάσαι λέγεται τὴν πύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς ὁ Κορίνθιος κεραμεύς, γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν Κωμικὸν Αριστοφάνη; *This Cup*, ſays he, *was invented by* Thericles *the* Corinthian *Potter, who was contemporary with* Ariſtophanes *the Comædian.* And in all probability, he had this indication from ſome Fable of that Poet's, now loſt; where that *Corinthian* was mention'd, as one then alive. But all the Plays that we have left of his, are known to have been written and acted between the LXXXIIX and XCVII Olympiads, which is an interval of XXXVI years. Take now the very firſt year of that number; and *Thericles*, with the Cups that had their appellation from him, come above CXX years after *Phalaris*'s death.

But I muſt remove one Objection that may be made againſt the force of this Argument: for ſome ancient Grammarians give a quite different account, why ſuch

Cups were called *Thericlean*. Some derive the word, Θηρίκλειος ἀπὸ τῶν θηρίων, *from the ſkins of Beaſts that were figured upon them*: and *Pamphilus* the *Alexandrian* (*m*) would have them called ſo, ἀπὸ τοῦ θῆρας κλονεῖν, *becauſe Beaſts were ſcared and frightned, when, in Sacrifices, Wine was poured upon them out of thoſe Cups.* So I interpret the words of *Pamphilus*; ἀπὸ τοῦ τ' Διόνυσον τοὺς θῆρας κλονεῖν, σπένδοντα ταῖς κύλιξι ταύταις κατ' αὐτῶν. For what is more ordinary in old Authors, than the memory of that cuſtom of pouring wine on the heads of the Victims?

(*m*) *Athenæus*, pag. 471.

> *Ipſa tenens dextra pateram pulcherrima Dido*
> *Candentis vaccæ media inter cornua fudit.*

Nor are wild Beaſts only called θῆρες, but tame too, ſuch as Bulls and Cows; as the Epigrammatiſt calls the *Minotaure*, ἄνθρωπον μιξοθῆρα. I cannot therefore comprehend why the moſt learned *Iſ. Caſaubon* will read σπεύδοντα in this paſſage, and not σπένδοντα. For I own, I ſee little or no ſenſe in it, according to his Lection. And as for the Authority of the ancient Epitomizer of *Athenæus*, who, he ſays, reads it σπεύδοντα; one may be certain, 'twas a fault only in that Copy of him that *Caſaubon* uſed. For *Euſtathius*, who appears never to have ſeen the true *Athenæus*, but

but only that Epitome, read it in his Book σπένδοντα, and took it in the ſame ſence that I now interpret it, [*p.* 1209. *Iliad.*] Η διότι θῆκας κλονεῖ, σπένδεσι γὰρ κατ' αὐτῶν κύλιξι τοιαύταις. And now for thoſe two derivations of the word Θηρίκλειος; was ever any thing ſo forced, ſo frigid, ſo unworthy of refutation? Does not common Analogy plainly ſhew, that as from Ηρακλῆς comes Ηράκλειος, from Σοφοκλῆς, Σοφόκλειος, and many ſuch like; ſo Θηρίκλειος muſt be from Θηρικλῆς? beſides ſo many expreſs Authorities for it, which I have cited before. To which I may add that of *Julius Pollux*, [l. VI. c. 16.] Θηρίκλειον καὶ Κάνθαρον ἀπὸ τῶν ποιησάντων: and *Plutarch* in *P. Æmilius*, [*pag.* 273.] Οἵτε τὰς Αντιγονίδας, καὶ Σελευκίδας, καὶ Θηρικλείους ἐπιδεικνύμενοι. And *Clemens Alexand.* [II. Pæd. p. 69.] Εὑρέτων τοίνυν Θηρίκλειοί τινες κύλικες, καὶ Αντιγονίδες, καὶ Κάνθαροι. For one may juſtly inferr, that both *Plutarch* and *Clemens* believed Θηρίκλειοι to be from Θηρικλῆς; becauſe they join them with thoſe other Cups, all which had their names from Men that either invented or uſed them. And ſo ſays a Manuſcript note upon that paſſage of *Clemens*; Θηρίκλειοι ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους τοῦ εὑρετοῦ. So that upon the whole, let *Pamphilus* and thoſe other Grammarians

help him as they can, our Sophiſt ſtands fully convicted, upon this Indictment, of forgery and impoſture.

I muſt here beg leave of the late learned Editors of our Mock *Phalaris*, with whom I muſt by and by have ſome further expoſtulation, to diſſent from their new verſion of this paſſage; whereby this argument from *Thericles* would vaniſh into nothing. For inſtead of *ten couple of* Thericlean *Cups*, as the former Interpreters honeſtly tranſlate it, they preſent us, as an emendation, with the like number of GLASSES, *Poculorum Vitreorum*, leaving us not the leaſt footſtep of our *Corinthian* Potter. But methinks theſe Glaſſes come in but odly and ſtingily among thoſe other things named there of great value, φιάλας ἀπέφθε χρυσᾶ, &c. *Veſſels of Gold and Silver, beautiful Slaves, fifty thouſand Drachmæ, and a liberal yearly Penſion for Life.* If *Agathocles* the Tyrant had made this Preſent of *a ſcore of Glaſſes*, it might have paſſed for a mark of favour: becauſe he was a Potter in his youth, and we might ſuppoſe them of his own making. And as I remember, *Diodorus* tells ſuch a ſtory of him. But why *Phalaris* ſhould make ſo cheap and brittle a Complement, I cannot conjecture. 'Tis true, *Suidas* tranſlates it a *Glaſs*, Θηρίκλειον

κλειον

κλειον ποτήριον ξάλινον : and *Etymolog. Mag.* Θηρίκλειον κύλικα, ποτήριον ὑέλινον. But we know the old Lexicons chiefly conſiſt of *Excerpta* out of *Scholiaſts* and *Gloſſaries* upon particular Authors; one of which, in one ſingle place, might expound it *a Glaſs*. But that it muſt univerſally mean ſo, or particularly in this paſſage before us, neither the uſe of the Language, nor good Senſe will allow. For beſides Earth, which was the firſt Material; ſome were made of Wood, as *Theophraſtus* ſays in the place already cited; others of Silver or Gold, as *Plutarch* in *P. Æmilius*; Οἱ δὲ τὰς Θηρικλείους ἢ ὅσα ἄλλα δεῖπνον ΧΡΥΣΩΜΑΤΑ τῷ Περσεῖ ὀπιδεικνύμενοι. And *Athenæus*, [lib. v. p. 199.] Φέροντες οἱ μὲν οἰνοχόας, οἱ δὲ φιάλας, οἱ δὲ Θηρικλείους μεγάλας, πάντα ΧΡΥΣΑ. And I conceive, it were more agreeable to the Generoſity of *Phalaris*, which is the ſubject of ſo many Letters, to ſuppoſe theſe *Thericlean* Cups to be Silver at leaſt, if not a more precious Metal.

IV. In the LXXXV Epiſtle, he boaſts of a great Victory obtained over the *Zancleans*; Ταυρομενείτας καὶ Ζαγκλείους συμμαχήσαντας Λεοντίνοις εἰς τέλος νενίκηκα. But the very preceding Letter, and the XXI, are directed to the *Meſſenians*, Μεσσηνίοις, and the City is there called Μεσσήνη;

and in the Firſt Epiſt. he ſpeaks of Πολυ-ηλεῖϛ ὁ Μεσσήνιϛ. Here we ſee we have mention made of *Zancleans* and *Meſſenians*; as if *Zancle* and *Meſſana* were two different Towns. Certainly the true *Phalaris* could not write thus; and it is a piece of ignorance inexcuſable in our Sophiſt, not to know that both thoſe names belong'd to one and the ſame City, at different times. *Strabo*, [lib.VI. p.268.] Μεσσήνη, Ζάγκλη πρότερον καλουμένη; Meſſana, *which was before called* Zancle. See alſo *Herodotus*, [lib.VII.] and *Diodorus*, [lib. IV.] and others. Perhaps it may be ſuſpected, in behalf of theſe Epiſtles, that this change of Name was made, during thoſe XVI years of *Phalaris*'s Tyranny; and then ſuppoſing the LXXXV Letter to be written before the change, and the other Three after it, this argument will be evaded. But *Thucydides* will not ſuffer this ſuſpicion to paſs, who relates, (*n*) that at the time of *Xerxes*'s expedition into *Greece* (which was Olymp. LXXIII.) *Anaxilaus* King of *Rhegium* beſieged *Zancle*, and took it, and called it *Meſſana*, from the *Peloponneſian* City of that name, the place of his nativity. The ſame ſays (*o*) *Herodotus*: and agreeably to this narrative, (*p*) *Diodorus* ſets down the death of this *Anaxilaus* Olymp. LXXVI, I. when he had reigned

(*n*) Lib.vi. P. 414.

(*o*) Lib.vi. cap. 23.

(*p*) Lib.xi. P. 37.

XVIII

XVIII years. Take now the lateſt accounts of *Phalaris*'s death, according to to St. *Hierom*; and above LX years intervene between that, and the new naming of *Zancle*. So that unleſs we dare aſcribe to that Tyrant a Spirit of Vaticination, we cannot acquit the Author of the Letters of ſo manifeſt a cheat.

But I love to deal ingenuouſly, and will not conceal one teſtimony in his favour, which is that of (q) *Pauſanias*, who tells the ſtory very differently from *Herodotus* and *Thucydides*, placing this ſame *Anaxilaus* of *Rhegium* about a CLXXX years higher than they do; That he aſſiſted the Refugees of *Meſſana* in *Peloponneſus*, after the ſecond war with the *Spartans*, to take *Zancle* in *Sicily*; which thereupon was called *Meſſana*, Olymp. XXIX: Ταῦτα ἢ ὅτι τῇ Ολυμπιάδι ἐπράχθη τῇ ἐνάτης καὶ εἰκοστῆς, ἣν Χιόνις Λάκων τὸ δεύτερον ἐνίκα, Μιλτιάδης παρ' Αθηναίοις ἄρχοντος. Now if this be true, we muſt needs put-in one word for our Sophiſt; that *Phalaris* might name the *Meſſenians*, without pretending to the gift of Prophecy. (r) *Cluverius* indeed would ſpoil all again; for he makes it a fault in our Copies of *Pauſanias*, and for εἰκοστῆς the XXIX Olymp. reads ἑξηκοστῆς the LXIX; which is too great a number, to do our Author any ſervice. But we will not

(q) *Meſſen.* P. 134.

(r) *Sicil. Antiq.* p. 85.

not take an advantage againſt him, from a miſtake of *Cluverius*; for without queſtion, the true Lection is εἰκοσῆς the XXIX; becauſe the time of the *Meſſenian* War agrees with that computation, and not with the other: and the ancient (*s*) Catalogue of the *Olympionicæ* puts *Chionis*'s Victory at that very year. Ολυμπιὰς εἰκοστὴ ἐνάτη· Χιόνις Λάκων σάδιον. Τελαχοσή. ὁ αὐτὸς τὸ δεύτερον. So that if *Pauſanias*'s Credit is able to bear him out, our Author, as to this preſent point, may ſtill come off with reputation. But alas! what can *Pauſanias* do for Him, or for himſelf, againſt *Herodotus*, and *Thucydides*, that liv'd ſo near the time they ſpeak of; againſt thoſe other unknown Authors that *Diodorus* tranſcribed; againſt the whole tenor of Hiſtory, confirm'd by ſo many Synchroniſms and Concurrences that even demonſtrate *Anaxilaus* to have lived in the days of *Xerxes*, and his Father; when *Theron*, and not *Phalaris*, was (*t*) Μόναρχος, *Monarch* of *Agrigentum*. Nay, though we ſhould be ſo obliging, ſo partial to our Sophiſt, as for his ſake to credit *Pauſanias* againſt ſo much greater Authority; yet ſtill the botch is incurable; 'tis running in debt with one man, to pay off another. For, how then comes it to paſs, that the *Meſſenians* in another Letter,

(*s*) *Euſeb. Scalig.* P. 39.

(*t*) *Herodot.* lib. vii. P. 438.

are

are in this called *Zancleans*? which, by that reckoning of *Pausanias*, had been an obsolete forgotten word, an hundred years before the date of this pretended Epistle.

V. That same XCII Letter, which has furnish'd us already with one detection of the Imposture, will, if strictly examin'd, make a second confession, from these words, ὃς αὐτὲς ἐκλείψω πίτυϛ δίκην; 'tis a threat of *Phalaris* to the *Himeræans*, *That he would extirpate them like a Pine-tree.* Now here again am I concerned for our Sophist, that he is thus taken tripping. For the Original of this Saying is thus related by (*u*) *Herodotus*: When the *Lampsaceni* in *Asia* had taken captive *Miltiades* the *Athenian*, *Crœsus* King of *Lydia* sent them a Message; That if they did not set him free, he would come and *extirpate them like a Pine*; σφέας πίτυϛ τρόπον ἀπείλεε ἐκλρίψειν. The men of *Lampsacus* understood not the meaning of that expression, *like a Pine*; till one of the eldest of them hit upon it, and told them, That *of all trees, the Pine, when once it is cut down, never grows again, but utterly perishes.* We see the phrase was then so new and unheard of, that it puzled a whole City. But now if *Crœsus* was upon that occasion the first Author of this Saying,

(*u*) Lib. vi. cap. 37.

Saying, what becomes of this Epiſtle? For this, as I obſerved before, being pretended to be written above a dozen years before *Phalaris*'s death, carries date at leaſt half a dozen before *Cræſus* began his reign.

Nay, there is good ground of ſuſpicion, that *Herodotus* himſelf, who wrote an Hundred Years after *Phalaris* was kill'd, was the firſt broacher of this expreſſion. For 'tis known, thoſe firſt Hiſtorians make every body's Speeches for them. So that the blunder of our Sophiſt is ſo much the more ſhameful. The Third Chapter of the VIII Book of *A. Gellius*, which is now loſt, carried this Title; *Quod Herodotus parum vere dixerit, unam ſolamque pinum arborum omnium cæſam nunquam denuo ex iiſdem radicibus pullulare*; "That *Herodotus* is in the wrong, in ſaying, that of all trees, a Pine only, if lopt, never grows again." I ſuppoſe, *Gellius*, in that Chapter told us, (*w*) out of *Theophraſtus*, of ſome other trees, beſide the Pine, that periſh by lopping; the *Pitch-tree*, the *Firr*, the *Palm*, the *Cedar*, and the *Cypreſs*. But I would have it obſerved, that he attributes the Saying, and the Miſtake about it, not to *Cræſus*, but to *Herodotus*: after whom, it became a Proverb, which denotes an utter deſtruction,

(*w*) *Hiſt. Pl.* lib. iv. c. 19. *Cauſ. Pl.* l. v. c. 24. *Plin.* l. xvii. c. 24.

ſtruction, without any poſſibility of flouriſhing again. See Πεύκης τρόπον in *Zenobius*, *Diogenianus*, and *Suidas*. And 'tis remarkable, that our Letter-monger has *Herodotus*'s very words, πίτυς and ἐκτρίψειν; when all thoſe three other Writers have πεύκη for πίτυς, and κόπτειν inſtead of ἐκτρίβειν: which ſhews he had in his eye and memory this very place of *Herodotus*. A ſtrange piece of ſtupidity, or elſe contempt of his Readers, to pretend to aſſume the garb and perſon of *Phalaris*, and yet knowingly to put words in his mouth, not heard of till a whole Century after him.

But here again our late Editors, as if they had been bribed for the Sophiſt, have lopt off and deſtroyed this branch of our Evidence, as far as lay in their power: for they have made bold to execute this Proverb upon it ſelf, and have quite *extirpated the Pine-tree* out of their new Verſion: ὃς αὐτὸς ἐκτρίψω πίτυϕ δίκλω; that is, *qui eos in arundinis morem conteret*, " who will bruiſe them like a Reed," (ſay our critical Interpreters.) It ſeems, the Tranſlation in the former Editions, *Qui eos exſcindam inſtar pinus*, was too eaſie and vulgar. In H. Scripture, indeed, there is mention, by a very elegant Metaphor, of *bruiſed* and *broken Reeds*. But why

why Reeds muſt be tranſplanted hither, and the innocent Pine rooted up, I confeſs to be above my ſmall underſtanding in Gardening.

VI. In the LXXXV Epiſtle, we have already taken notice of our Mock-Tyrant's triumph; ὅτι Ταυρομενείτας καὶ Ζαγκλαίους εἰς τέλος νενίκηκε, *That he had utterly routed the* Tauromenites *and the* Zancleans. But there's an old and true Saying, Πολλὰ καινὰ τοῦ πολέμου, *Many new and ſtrange things happen in War.* For we have juſt now ſeen thoſe ſame routed *Zancleans* riſe up again, after a Thouſand Years, to give him a worſe defeat. And now the others too are taking their turn to revenge their old loſſes. For Theſe, though they are called *Tauromenites*, both here, and in the XV, XXXI, and XXXIII Epiſtles, make proteſtation againſt the name; and declare they were called *Naxians*, in the days of the true *Phalaris*. *Taurominium, quæ antea Naxos*, ſays *Pliny*, [*lib.* III. *c.* VIII.] *Taurominium, quam priſci Naxon vocabant*, ſays *Solinus*, [*cap.* XI.] Whence it is, that *Herodotus* and *Thucydides*, becauſe they writ before the change of the name, never ſpeak of *Taurominium*, but of *Naxos*, and the *Naxians*. A full account of the time, and the reaſon, and the manner of the change, is thus given by (*x*) *Diodorus*.

(*x*) Lib. XIV p. 282, & 305.

Some

Some *Sicilians* planted themſelves Olymp. XCVI, 1. upon a Hill called *Taurus*, near the ruines of *Naxus*, and built a new town there, which they called *Tauromenion*, ἀπὸ τῦ ταῦρ ἢ μένειν, from *their ſettlement upon* Taurus. About Forty Years after this, Olymp. CV. 3. (*y*) one *Andromachus* a *Tauromenite* gathered all the remnant of the old *Naxians* that were diſperſed through *Sicily*, and perſuaded them to fix there. This is ſuch a plain and punctual teſtimony, that neither the power and ſtratagems of the Tyrant, nor the rhetoric of the Sophiſt, are able to evade it. Where are thoſe then, that cry up *Phalaris* for the florid Author of the Letters? who was burnt in his own Bull, above CL Years before *Taurominium* was ever thought on.

(*y*) Lib. XV. P. 411.

But I ſhall not omit one thing in defenſe of the Epiſtles; which though it will not do the work, let it go, however, as far as it can. We have allowed, that *Pythagoras* was contemporary with *Phalaris*; and yet in the Hiſtory of that Philoſopher, we are told of his converſation and exploits at *Taurominium*. *Porphyry* ſays, (*z*) *He deliver'd* Croton *and* Himera, ἢ Ταυρομένιον, *and* Taurominium, *from Tyrants*: and, (*a*) *That in one and the ſame day he was at* Metapontium *in* Italy, *and* Tauro-

(*z*) *Vita Pythag.* p. 169.

(*a*) P. 192, & 193.

Taurominium *in* Sicily. The ſame ſtory is told by *(b) Jamblichus*; who ſupplies us too with another, (c) *That a young man of* Taurominium *being got drunk,* τοῦ ϑ-μενείτε μειϑακὶς, Pythagoras *played him ſober by a few tunes of grave Spondees.* Theſe ſeveral paſſages ſeem to concurr with, and confirm the credit of the Letters, that *Taurominium* had a Name and Being in the time of *Pythagoras* and *Phalaris.* All this would be very plauſible, and our Sophiſt might come off with a whole skin, but for a croſs figure in his own Art, *Rhetoric*, called *Prolepſis* or *Anticipation*, *viz.* when Poets or Hiſtorians call any place by a name, which was not yet known in the times they write of. As when *Virgil* ſays of *Æneas*,

(b) *Jambl.* P. 128.
(c) P. 109.

——— *Lavinaque venit Littora:*

and of *Dædalus*,

Chalcidicáq; levis tandem ſuperadſtitit arce:

he is excuſed by *Prolepſis*; though thoſe places were not yet called ſo in the times of *Dædalus* and *Æneas.* So when *Porphyry* and *Jamblichus* name *Taurominium* in the ſtory of *Pythagoras*; meaning *Naxos*, which was afterwards called ſo; the ſame figure acquits Them. For 'tis no more, than when I ſay, Julius Cæſar *conquered* France,

France, *and made an expedition into* England: though I know that *Gaul* and *Britain* were the names in that age. But when *Phalaris* mentions *Taurominium* ſo many generations before it was heard of, he cannot have the benefit of that ſame *Prolepſis*. For this is not a Poetical, but a Prophetical Anticipation. And he muſt either have had the Præſcience and Divination of the *Sibyls*, or his Epiſtles are as falſe and commentitious as our *Sibylline Oracles*.

VII. The xxxv Letter to *Polygnotus* preſents us with a Sentence of Moral, ὅτι λόγῳ ἔργα σκιὰ παρὰ τοῖς σωφρονεστέροις πεπίστευται, *That wiſe men take Words for the ſhadow of Things*; that is, as the Shadow is not alone without the preſence of the Body, ſo Words are accompanied with the Action. 'Tis a very notable Saying, and we are obliged to the Author of it; and if *Phalaris* had not modeſtly hinted, that others had ſaid it before him, we might have taken it for his own. But then there was either a ſtrange jumping of good Wits, or *Democritus* was a ſorry Plagiary; for He laid claim to the firſt Invention of it, as (*d*) *Diogenes Laertius* ſays, Τοῦτο ἔφη καὶ τὸ Λόγῳ ἔργα σκιή: and (*e*) *Plutarch*, Λόγῳ γὰρ ἔργα σκιὴ κατὰ Δημόκριτον. What ſhall we ſay to this matter?

(*d*) *Vita Democrit.*
(*e*) *De Educat. Puer.*

matter? *Democritus* had the character of a man of Probity and Wit; who had neither inclination, nor need, to filch the Sayings of others. Beſides, here are *Plutarch* and *Diogenes*, two witneſſes that would ſcorn to flatter, and to aſcribe it to *Democritus*, had they ever read it in others before him. This bears hard indeed upon the Author of the Letters: but how can we help it? He ſhould have minded his hits better, when he was minded to act the Tyrant. For *Democritus*, the firſt Author of the Sentence, was too young to know even *Pythagoras*, τὰ πρῶ χεόνων μάχεται, ſays (*f*) *Diogenes*; and yet *Pythagoras* ſurvived *Phalaris*, nay, depoſed him, if we will believe his Scholars. We may allow Forty Years ſpace for *Democritus*'s writing; from the LXXXIV Olymp. to the XCIV, in which he died. Now the earlieſt of this is above an Hundred Years after the laſt period of *Phalaris*.

(*f*) *Vita Democ.*

I am ſenſible that (*g*) *Michael Pſellus* refers this Saying to *Simonides*; and (*h*) *Iſidorus Peleuſ.* to the *Lacedæmonians*. But theſe two are of little authority, in a caſe of this nature, againſt *Plutarch* and *Diogenes*. Neither would the matter be mended, ſhould we accept of their teſtimony. For *Simonides* was but Seven Years old, or, as others ſay, yet unborn, when

(*g*) *De Dæm.*

(*h*) Epiſt. 252, & 259.

when *Phalaris* was kill'd. And were it a *Lacedæmonian* Apophthegm, though the date be undetermined, it might fairly be preſumed to be more recent than He.

VIII. In the LI Epiſtle to *Eteonicus* there is another Moral Sentence; Θνητὸς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, ὡς φάσι τινες, οὐ πρέπει; *Mortal Men ought not to entertain Immortal Anger.* But I am afraid he will have no better ſucceſs with this, than the former. For (*i*) *Ariſtotle*, in his *Rhetoric*, among ſome other ſententious Verſes, cites this Iambic, as commonly known;

(*i*) Lib. ii. cap. 21.

Θνητὸν ὄντα θάνατον ὀργὴν μὴ φύλαττε θνητὸς ὤν.

This, though the Author of it be not named, was, probably, like moſt of thoſe Proverbial *Gnomæ*, borrow'd from the Stage; and conſequently, muſt be later than *Phalaris*, let it belong to what Poet you pleaſe, Tragic or Comic.

But becauſe it may be ſuſpected, that the Poet himſelf might take the Thought from common uſage, and only give it the turn and meaſure of a Verſe; let us ſee if we can diſcover ſome plainer foot-ſteps of Imitation, and detect the lurking Sophiſt under the mask of the

(k) Tit. xx. Περὶ Ὀργῆς.

Tyrant. (k) *Stobæus* gives us these Verses out of *Euripides*'s *Philoctetes*;

Ὥσπερ γὰρ θνητὸν ἡ τὸ σῶμ' ἡμῶν ἔφυ,
Οὕτω φερόντει μηδὲ τλῶ ὀργλῶ ἔχειν
Ἀθάνατον, ὅστις σωφρονεῖν ὀπίσαλαι.

Now to him that compares these with the words of the Epistle, 'twill be evident, that the Author had this very passage before his Pen; there is ἔχειν and φερόντει; not only a sameness of sense, but even of words, and those not necessary to the Sentence: which could not fall out by accident. And where has he now a Friend at a pinch, to support his sinking credit? for *Euripides* was not born in *Phalaris*'s time. Nay, to come nearer to our mark; from (l) *Aristophanes* the famous Grammarian, (who, after *Aristotle*, *Callimachus*, and others, writ the Διδασκαλίαι, *A Catalogue and Chronology of all the Plays of the Poets*; a Work, were it now extant, most useful to ancient History,) we know that this very Fable, *Philoctetes*, was written Olymp. LXXXVII; which is CXX Years after the Tyrant's Destruction.

(l) *Argument. Medeæ Eurip.*

IX. The XII Epistle exhibits *Phalaris* making this complement to his Friends; Ὧν εὐτυχούντων, κἀν αὐτὸς ἑτέρῳ συμπλακῶ δ' ἀέμονι, ἡδεῖς ἡδὲν ἦτον εὐτυχεῖν δόξω; *That while they continued in prosperity, his joy*

for

for that, though himſelf ſhould fall under misfortunes, would ſtill make him happy. But methinks thoſe words, Ἑτέρῳ Δαίμονι, *the Other God, or Genius*, that is, the *Bad* one, have a quaintneſs in them ſomething Poetical, and I am miſtaken if they be not borrowed from ſome Retainer to the Muſes. And now I call it to mind, they are (*m*) *Pindar's*, (*m*) *Pyth.* 3.

Δαίμων δ' ἕτερος
Ἐς χαλκὸν τρέψας ἐδαμάσατό νιν·

or *Callimachus's*; for this *Scazon* of his is there cited by the Scholiaſt,

Οὐ πάντες, ἀλλ' ὅς ἔχεν ἕτερος Δαίμων.

Whether of theſe our Author made bold with, I cannot determine. *Pindar* I ſhould encline to gueſs, but that I find him familiar with *Callimachus* upon another occaſion; Epiſt. CXXII. ſpeaking of *Perillus's* invention of the Brazen Bull; Ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τ' ὄλεθρον εὗρε καὶ τῷ ἐπιβουλεύοντων ἀχθηδόνατον. Where he has taken that expreſſion, τὸν ὄλεθρον εὗρε, from theſe Verſes of (*n*) *Callimachus* that concern the ſame buſineſs; (*n*) *Schol. Pind. Pyth.* 1.

Πρῶτος ἐπεὶ τ' ταῦρον ἐκαίνισεν, ὅς τ' ὄλεθρον
Εὗρε, τ' ἐν χαλκῷ κὴ πυρὶ γινόμενον.

But be it either of them as you will, I ſuppoſe the Ages of both thoſe Poets are

well enough known; so that without any computation of Years, one may pronounce these fine Epistles not to belong to *Phalaris* himself, but to his Secretary the Sophist.

X. The XXIII Epistle is directed to *Pythagoras*; and there he gives to his Doctrine and Institution the name of *Philosophy*; Ἡ Φαλάριδος τυραννὶς τὸν Πυθαγόρου ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ πλεῖον ὅσον δεκὰ κεχωρίσθαι. And so again in the LVI. he gives him the title of *Philosopher*, Πυθαγόρᾳ τῷ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΩ. I could shew now, from a whole crowd of Authors, that *Pythagoras* was the first man that invented that word; but I shall content my self with two, *Diogenes Laertius*, and *Cicero*. The former says, (o) Φιλοσοφίαν πρῶτος ὠνόμασε Πυθαγόρας, καὶ ἑαυτὸν Φιλόσοφον, ἐν Σικυῶνι διαλεγόμενος Λέοντι, τῷ Σικυωνίων τυράννῳ, ἢ Φλιασίων; Pythagoras *first named Philosophy, and called himself* Philosopher, *in conversation with* Leon *the Tyrant of* Sicyon, *or, as some say, of* Phlius. The latter tells us, (p) *That when* Pythagoras *had discoursed before* Leon, *the Tyrant much taken with his wit and eloquence, asked him what Art or Trade he profest. Art, says* Pythagoras, *I profess none, but I am a* PHILOSOPHER. Leon, *in admiration at the newness of the name, enquires what*

(o) P. 3. & 26.

(p) *Tuscul. Quæst.* l. v.

what thoſe Philoſophers were, and wherein they differed from other men; "Quinam "eſſent Philoſophi, & quid inter eos & "reliquos intereſſet." What a difference is here between the two Tyrants? The one knows not what *Philoſopher* means; the other ſeems to account it as threadbare a word, as the name of *Wiſe* Men of *Greece*; and that too, before ever he had ſpoken with *Pythagoras*. We cannot tell, at this diſtance of time, which Converſation was firſt, that with *Phalaris*, or that with *Leon*. But allowing *Leon*'s to be the firſt, yet it could not be long before the other. And 'tis very hard to believe, that the fame of ſo ſmall a buſineſs could ſo ſoon reach *Phalaris*'s ear in his Caſtle, through his Guard of Blue-coats, and the loud bellowings of his Bull. Nay, could we ſuppoſe him to have heard of it; yet ſurely when he had written to *Pythagoras*, he would have uſher'd the Word in with ſome kind of introduction, *That Science which you call* Philoſophy; and not ſpeak of it as familiarly, as if it had been the language of his Nurſe.

XI. In the LXIII Epiſtle, he is in great wrath with one *Ariſtolochus*, a Tragic Poet that no body ever heard of, *for writing Tragedies againſt him*, κατ' ἐμοῦ γράφειν Τραγῳδίας: and in the XCVII. he threatens

Lyſinus, another Poet of the ſame ſtamp with the former, *for writing againſt him both Tragedies and Hexameters*, ἀλλ᾽ ἔπη καὶ τραγῳδίας εἰς ἐμὲ γράφεις. Now to forgive him that ſilly expreſſion, of writing Tragedies *againſt Him*, for he could not be the Argument of Tragedy, while he was living; I muſt take the boldneſs to tell him, who am out of his reach, that he lays a falſe crime to their charge. For there was no ſuch Thing nor Word as *Tragedy*, while he tyranniz'd at *Agrigentum*. That we may ſlight that obſcure ſtory about *Epigenes* the *Sicyonian*, *Theſpis*, we know, was the firſt Inventor of it;

Ignotum Tragicæ genus inveniſſe camænæ
Dicitur, & plauſtris vexiſſe poemata Theſpis.

Neither was the Name of Tragedy more ancient than the Thing; as ſometimes it happens, when an old Word is borrowed and applied to a new Notion; but both were born together: the Name being taken from Τράγος, the *Goat* that was the Prize to the beſt Poet and Actor. But *Alceſtis*, the firſt Tragedy of *Theſpis*, was acted about (*q*) the LXI Olymp. which is more than twelve Years after *Phalaris*'s death.

(*q*) *Marm. Arund. Suidas* Θέσπις.

XII. Had all other ways fail'd us of detecting this Impoſtor, yet his very Speech

Speech had betray'd him. For his Language is *Attic*, the beloved Dialect of the Sophiſts, in which all their Μελέται, or *Exerciſes*, were compoſed; in which they affected to excell each other, even to Pedantry and Soleciſm. But he had forgot that the Scene of theſe Epiſtles was not *Athens*, but *Sicily*, where the *Doric* tongue was generally ſpoken and written; as beſides the teſtimonies of others, the very Thing ſpeaks it ſelf in the Remains of *Sicilian* Authors, *Sophron*, *Epicharmus*, *Steſichorus*, *Theocritus*, *Moſchus*, and others. How comes it to paſs then, that our Tyrant tranſacts every thing in *Attic*, not only foreign Affairs of State, but domeſtic Matters with *Sicilian* Friends, but the very Accounts of his Houſhold? Pray, how came that Idiom to be the Court Language at *Agrigentum*? 'Tis very ſtrange, that a Tyrant, and ſuch a Tyrant as He, ſhould ſo doat on the Dialect of a Democraty, which was ſo eminently μισοτύραννος, the *Hater of Tyrants*; which, in his very days, had driven out *Piſiſtratus*, though a generous and eaſie Governour. Eſpecially, ſince in thoſe early times, before Stage-Poetry and Philoſophy and Hiſtory had made it famous over *Greece*, that Dialect was no more valued than any of the reſt.

I would

I would not be here miſtaken; as if I affirmed, that the *Doric* was abſolutely univerſal, or original in *Sicily*. I know, that the old *Sicani*, the Natives of the Iſle, had a peculiar Language of their own; and that the *Greek* Tongue there, like the *Punic*, was only a foreigner, being introduced by thoſe Colonies that planted themſelves there. Moſt of which coming from *Corinth*, *Crete*, *Rhodes*, &c. where all ſpoke the *Doric* Dialect; thence it was that the ſame Idiom ſo commonly obtained almoſt all over *Sicily*; as it appears to have done, to omit other teſtimonies, from the ancient Medals of that Iſland, ΤΑΥΡΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ, ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΩΝ, ΘΕΡΜΙΤΑΝ, ΠΑΝΟΡΜΙΤΑΝ, ΑΙΛΥΒΑΙΙΤΑΝ, ΣΕΛΙΝΩΝΤΙΩΝ; all which words, inſcribed upon their Money, demonſtrate the *Doric* Dialect to have been then the language of thoſe Cities. 'Tis true, there came ſome Colonies to *Sicily*, from *Eubœa*, and *Samos*, and other places; which, in thoſe Parts where they ſettled, might ſpeak, for a while, the *Ionic* or the *Attic*; and afterwards, being mixed with the *Dorians*, might make a new ſort of Dialect, a compound of both: as (*r*) *Thucydides* obſerves of *Himera*, that the language of that City was at firſt a medly of *Doric* and *Chalcidic*. But that is no more than what

(*r*) Lib. vi. p. 414.

happen'd

happen'd even in *Greece* it ſelf, where there were many (s) ὑποδιαιρέσεις τοπικαὶ, *local ſub-Diviſions* of every Dialect, one Country having always ſome ſingularity of Speech, not uſed by any other. But thoſe little peculiarities do not hinder us from ſaying in general, that the *Sicilians* ſpoke *Doric*. For the other Dialects were ſwallowed up and extinguiſhed by thoſe two powerful Cities of *Dorian* Original, *Syracuſe*, and *Agrigentum*, that ſhared the whole Iſland between them. *Syracuſe* was a *Corinthian* Colony, and ſpoke (t) the Dialect of her Mother City. *Agrigentum* was firſt built by the *Geloans* of *Sicily*, who had been themſelves a Plantation of the *Cretans* and *Rhodians*, both of which were *Dorian* Nations. So that upon the whole, though in ſome other Towns, and for a time, there might be a few foot-ſteps of the *Ionic* and *Attic*; yet our Sophiſt is inexcuſable, in making a Tyrant of *Agrigentum*, a City of *Doric* Language and Original, write Epiſtles in ſuch a Dialect, as if he had gone to School at *Athens*.

(s) *Vetus Auctor* Περὶ Διαλέκτων.

(t) *Theocrit.* Id. XV.

But there is a (u) learned *Greek* Profeſſor (whoſe Pardon I muſt ask, that I forgot to name him above, among the Patrons of *Phalaris*,) who, after he has aſſerted the credit of *Euripides*'s Letters, gra-

(u) Vid. *Eurip.* Edit. *Cantab.* p. 523.

gratuitouſly undertakes to apologize for Theſe too, about this matter of the Dialect. Firſt, ſays he, (*w*) *becauſe* Phalaris *was born at* Aſtypala, *an Iſland of the* Cyclades, *where was an* Athenian *Colony*, that is one reaſon for his ſpeaking *Attic*. It were eaſie to overthrow this firſt argument at once; by refuting our ſpurious Epiſtles, and by ſhewing, from much better Authority, that *Phalaris* was a *Sicilian* born. But I may ſpeak, perhaps of that by and by; and I will have every Proof I bring ſtand by it ſelf, without the ſupport of another. Let us allow then, that *Phalaris* came from *Aſtypalæa*, (for ſo it is to be called;) not that Iſle of the *Cyclades*, according to (*x*) *Stephanus*; but of the *Sporades*, mention'd by (*y*) *Strabo* and (*z*) *Pliny*: for this latter was neareſt to *Crete*, whither *Phalaris*'s Wife and Son are ſuppoſed to have fled, Epiſt. LXIX. 'Tis true, our late induſtrious Editors have diſcovered a new place of his birth, (*a*) *Aſtypalæa*, a City of *Crete*, never mention'd before by any Geographer, ſituate in the 370th. *deg.* of Longit. bearing South and by North off of *Utopia*. And I am wholly of their opinion, that he was born in that, or in none of them. But becauſe Tradition is rather for the Iſland, we will beg their good leave to ſuppoſe it to

(*w*) Is enim *Aſtypala* natus erat, una ex *Cycladibus*, ubi *Athenienſium* erat Colonia.

(*x*) v. Ἀσυπάλ.

(*y*) Lib. x. p. 488.

(*z*) Lib. iv. cap. 12.

(*a*) Vid. Vitam *Phalar.* & Indicem. Edit. *Oxon.*

to be ſo: and There, as it ſeems, was formerly a Plantation of *Athenians*; and *Phalaris* being one of their Poſterity, muſt needs, for that reaſon, have a twang of their Dialect. Now, what a pity 'tis, that *Phalaris* himſelf, or his Secretary, did not know of this Plantation, when he writ the cxx Letter to the *Athenians*, Ὦ σοφώταλοι γηγενεῖς Ἀθηναῖοι! What a fine complement would he have made upon that ſubject of their Kindred! If any one know an expreſs teſtimony, that there was an *Athenian* Colony at that *Aſtypalæa*, he can teach me more than I now remember. This I know in general, from (*b*) *Thucydides* and others, that the *Athenians* ſent Colonies to moſt of the Iſlands; and ſo That may come in among the reſt. But what then? muſt the Language for ever afterwards be *Attic*, whereever the *Athenians* once had footing? *Thucydides* ſays in the ſame paſſage, That they planted *Ionia*. They had Colonies at *Miletus*, at *Epheſus*, and moſt of the Maritime Towns of *Aſia Minor*. Nay, the *Ionians* and the *Attics* were anciently one People, and the Language the ſame: and when *Homer* ſays, (*c*) Ἔνθα δὲ Βοιωτοὶ καὶ Ἰάονες, by the latter he is known to mean the *Athenians*. And yet we ſee, that in proceſs of time, the Colonies had a different

(*b*) Lib. 1. p. 10. Καὶ Ἰωνας μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Νησιωτῶν τὰς πολλὰς ἔκτισαν.

(*c*) *Strabo*, lib. viii. p. 333. & lib. ix. p. 392.

rent Dialect from that of the Mother Nation. Why then muſt *Aſtypalæa* needs be *Attic?* and that ſo tenaciouſly, that twenty Years living in *Sicily* could not at all alter it in one of her Iſlanders? He was part of that time a (*d*) Publican, or Collector of Taxes and Cuſtoms: Could not that perpetual negoce and converſe with *Dorians* bring his mouth, by degrees, to ſpeak a little broader? Would not He that (*e*) aim'd at Monarchy, and for that deſign ſtudied to be popular, have quitted his old Dialect for that of the place; and not by every word he ſpoke make the invidious diſcovery of his being a Stranger? But what if, after all, even the *Aſtypalæans* themſelves ſhould be found to ſpeak *Doric*? If we make a conjecture from their neighbourhood, and the company they are put in, we can ſcarce queſtion but they were *Dorians*. (*f*) *Strabo* ſays, the Iſland lies between *Cos*, and *Rhodes*, and *Crete*, μεταξὺ τ῀ Κῶ μάλιστα καὶ Ῥόδου, καὶ Κρήτης. And that all theſe three uſed the *Doric* Dialect, is too well known, to need any proof.

(*d*) *Polyænus Strat.*

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Lib. x. p. 488.

But let us hear the Second Apology for the Atticiſm of *Phalaris*. (*g*) He defends him by the like practice of others; that

(*g*) *Sed nec ipſe Diodorus Siculus nec Empedocles Agrigentinus, nec Ocellus Lucanus Dorice ſed Attice fere ſcripſerunt.*

being

being *Dorians* born, repudiated their vernacular Idiom for that of the *Athenians*; as *Diodorus* of *Agyrium*, *Empedocles* of *Agrigentum*, and *Ocellus* of *Lucania*. So that, though *Phalaris* be ſuppoſed to be a Native of *Sicily*, yet here is an excuſe for him, for quitting the Language. But I conceive, with ſubmiſſion, that this Argument is built partly upon a vulgar Miſtake, and partly upon ſuch Inſtances as are quite different and aliene from the caſe of our Epiſtles.

Ocellus Lucanus, the *Pythagorean* Philoſopher, writ a ſmall Treatiſe *Of the Nature of the Univerſe*; which has been ſeveral times printed, and is ἐν κοινῇ διαλέκτῳ, in the common and ordinary *Greek*. But, if I may expect thanks for the diſcovery, I dare engage to make out; that the Author compos'd it, not in the dreſs that it now wears, but in *Doric*, his own Country faſhion. For I find, it was agreed and covenanted among all the Scholars of that *Italian* Sect, (*h*) φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ, *to uſe their own Mother-Tongue*: this was the injunction of *Pythagoras*; this was the *teſſera* of the whole Party; and thoſe that know any thing of their ſtory, will believe they would have loſt their Lives, rather than have broken it. 'Tis moſt certain, if one had publiſh'd a Book againſt that

(*h*) *Jamblichus Vit. Pythagor.* 202.

that Injunction, he would have been baniſh'd the Society. Beſides, when *Jamblichus* tells us of this Compact of theirs, he makes not one Exception to it; which he could not have miſs'd, neither from ignorance nor forgetfulneſs, if ſo common a Tract as this of *Ocellus* had been writ in the *Attic*. Nay, we are aſſured, that other Pieces of this Author were made in the *Doric*; as one *Of Law*, Περὶ Νόμου, cited by (*i*) *Stobæus*: the fragment begins thus; Συνέχει τὰ μὲν σκάνεα ζῶα, ταύτας δ᾽ ἄπιον ψυχά· τ᾽ ἦ ἠόσμον ἁρμονία, ταύτας ἦ ἄπτιϙ ὁ θεός. But, which is plain demonſtration, four citations are brought by the (*k*) ſame Writer out of this very Book, Περὶ τ τᾶ πάντϙ φύσεως, *About the Nature of the Univerſe*; all which are in *Doric*, and not, as they are now extant, in the ordinary Dialect. The firſt of them begins thus, Ἔτι ἦ τὸ ἄναρχον ϗ ἀτελεύταλον ϗ τῶ χήμαϙ ϗ τᾶς κινάσιϙ ϗ τῶ χρόνω ϗ τᾶς ὠσίας τᾶτο πιϛᾶ): which is thus extant in the vulgar (*l*) *Ocellus*, p. 16. Ἔτι ἦ ϗ τὸ ἄναρχον ϗ ἀτελεύτητον ϗ τᾶ χήμαϙ ϗ τ κινήσεως ϗ τ ὠσίας τᾶτο πιϛᾶται. The ſecond, thus beginning, Ἔπει δ᾽ ἐν τῷ παντί, extant *p.* 17. The third, Πράτως γὰρ ὕλα τὸ πανδεχές, &c. thus extant, *p.* 21. Πρώτως ὕλη τὸ πανδεχές. The fourth, Παντελὴς ἦ φθορὰ τᾶς περὶ τὰν γᾶν

(*i*) *Eclog. Phyſ.* c. 16.

(*k*) Ibid. c. 24.

(*l*) Edit. *Cantab.*

γᾶν διακοσμιώτος; extant in ordinary *Greek*, p. 31. Παντελὴς ἦ φθορὰ τ περὶ τὸν γῆν διακοσμήσεως. From which paſſages theſe two points are manifeſtly evinced; That *Ocellus* compoſed his Writings in *Doric*, and ſo is falſely brought in for an Excuſe to our *Phalaris*: and, which is much more conſiderable, That this Tract of his now extant, is to be acknowledged for a genuine Work; which hitherto Learned Men have doubted of, from this very buſineſs of the Dialect. For we now ſee by theſe Fragments, that every word of the true Book is faithfully preſerved; the *Doric* only being changed into the ordinary Language, at the fancy of ſome Copyer ſince the days of *Stobæus*.

As for *Empedocles* and *Diodorus*, a Poet and an Hiſtorian, their caſe is widely remote from that of our Tyrant. The former, being to write an Epic Poem, ſhow'd an excellent judgment in laying aſide his Country Dialect for that of the *Ionians*; which *Homer* and his followers had uſed before him, and had given it, as it were, the dominion of all Heroic Poetry. For the *Doric* Idiom had not Grace and Majeſty enough for the Subject he was engaged in; being proper indeed for Mimes, Comedies, and Paſtorals, where Men of ordinary rank are repreſented; or for

Epigrams, a Poem of a low vein; or for Lyrics, and the Chorus of Tragedy, upon the account of the *Doric* Muſic; but not to be uſed in Heroic, without great diſadvantage. And the Hiſtorian likewiſe, with the reſt of that and other *Dorian* Nations, *Philiſtus*, *Timæus*, *Ephorus*, *Herodotus*, *Dionyſius Halic.* &c. had great reaſon to decline the uſe of their vernacular Tongue, as improper for Hiſtory; which, beſides the affectation of Eloquence, aims at Eaſineſs and Perſpicuity, and is deſigned for general uſe. But the *Doric* is courſe and ruſtic, and always clouded with an obſcurity; ἐχέσης τι κὴ ἀσαφὲς τ Δωρίδ Ⓠ διαλέκτ, ſays (*m*) *Porphyry*; who attributes the decay of the *Pythagorean* Sect to their writing in that Dialect. And we have juſt now ſeen an inſtance of it; ſince ſome body thought it worth his labour, to tranſcribe *Ocellus* into another Idiom. And now, what affinity is there between *Phalaris*'s caſe, and that of Hiſtorians, or Heroic Poets? What mighty motives can be here for aſſuming a foreign Dialect? The Letters are dated in the middle of *Sicily*, moſtly directed to the next Towns, or to ſome of his own Domeſtics, about private affairs, or even the expences of his family, and never deſigned for the public view. If any will ſtill

(*m*) Vita *Pythag.* p. 205.

ſtill excuſe the Tyrant for Atticizing in thoſe circumſtances, 'tis hard to deny them the glory of being the faithfulleſt of his Vaſſals.

XIII. But ſince Tyrants will not be confined by Laws; let us ſuppoſe, if you will, that our *Phalaris* might make uſe of the *Attic*, for no reaſon at all, but his own arbitrary humour and pleaſure: yet we have ſtill another Indictment againſt the credit of the Epiſtles. For even the *Attic* of the true *Phalaris*'s age is not there repreſented; but a more recent Idiom and Stile, that by the whole thread and colour of it betrays it ſelf to be a thouſand years younger than He. Every living Language, like the perſpiring Bodies of living Creatures, is in perpetual motion and alteration; ſome words go off, and become obſolete; others are taken in, and by degrees grow into common uſe; or the ſame word is inverted to a new ſenſe and notion; which in tract of time makes as obſervable a change in the air and features of a Language, as Age makes in the lines and mien of a Face. All are ſenſible of this in their own native Tongues, where continual Uſe makes every man a Critic. For what *Engliſhman* does not think himſelf able, from the very turn and faſhion of the Stile, to di-

ſtinguiſh a freſh *Engliſh* compoſition from another a hundred years old? Now there are as real and ſenſible differences in the ſeveral ages of *Greek*; were there as many that could diſcern them. But very few are ſo verſed and practiſed in that Language, as ever to arrive at that ſubtilty of Taſt. And yet as few will be content to reliſh or diſlike a thing, not by their own Senſe, but by another man's Palate. So that ſhould I affirm, That I know the novity of theſe Epiſtles from the whole body and form of the work; none, perhaps, would be convinced by it, but thoſe that without my indication could diſcover it by themſelves. I ſhall let that alone then, and point only at a few particular marks and moles in the Letters, which every one that pleaſes may know them by. In the very firſt Epiſtle; ὧν ἐμοὶ προφέρεις, *which you accuſe me of*, is an innovation in language; for which the Ancients uſed προφέρεις. In the XVII. προδεδωκότα, *having given before*, never uſed by the Ancients in that ſenſe, but always for *having betrayed*. In the LI. βουλομένῳ ἑμὲ διώκειν, *deſirous to follow me*, where he ſpeaks of his Wife that would accompany him in his exile: but διώκειν anciently ſignified, *to purſue*; when that which fled, fear'd and ſhun'd the Purſuer. In the

CXLII,

CXLII, among other Presents to a Bride, he sends δυγατέρας τέτταρας ὁμήλικας; which would anciently have signified *Daughters*: but he here means it of *Virgins* or *Maidens*; as *Fille* and *Figlia* signifie in *French* and *Italian*; which is a most manifest token of a later *Greek*. Even (*n*) *Tzetzes*, when he tells the story out of this Epistle, interprets it *Maids*, δερματίνας. In the LXXVII, πολλοὶ παίδων ὄντες ἐρασταὶ, *many that are fond of their children*; for that is his sense of the words; which, of old, would have been taken for *a flagitious love of Boys*; as if he had said, πολλοὶ ὄντες παιδερασταί. They that will make the search, may find more of this sort; but I suppose these are sufficient to unmask the recent Sophist under the person of the old Tyrant.

(*n*) *Chiliad.* P. 196.

XIV. But should we connive at his using the *Attic* Dialect, and say not a word of those flaws and innovations in his Stile; yet there is one thing still, that, I fear, will more difficultly be forgiven him; that is, a very slippery way in telling of Money. This is a tender point, and will make every body shy and cautious of entertaining him. In the LXXXV Epistle he talks of a *Hundred Talents*, τάλαντα ἑκατόν; of Fifteen more, in the CXVIII; Eight, in the CXXXVII; Seven, in

the CIV ; Five, in the CXLIII ; and Three, in the XCV. Theſe affairs being tranſacted in the middle of *Sicily*, and all the perſons concerned being natives and inhabitants there; who would not be ready to conclude, that he meant the *Talent* of the Country? ſince he gives not the leaſt hint of his meaning a foreign Summ. If a bargain were made in *England*, to pay ſo many Pounds or Marks; and the party ſhould pretend at laſt, that he meant *Scots* Marks, or *French* Livres: few, I ſuppoſe, would care to have Dealings with him. Now this is the very caſe in ſo many of theſe Letters. In the LXX, indeed, he is more punctual with *Polyclitus* his Phyſician ; for he ſpeaks expreſly of *Attic* Money, Μυριάδας Ἀττικὰς πέντε. But this is ſo far from excuſing him, that it is a plain condemnation out of his own mouth. For if it was neceſſary to tell *Polyclitus*, that he meant the *Attic* Money, and not the *Sicilian* ; why had he not the ſame caution and ingenuity towards all the reſt? We are to know, That in *Sicily*, as in moſt other Countries, the Name and Value of their Coins, and the way of reckoning by Summs, was peculiar. The Summ *Talent*, in the *Sicilian* Accompt, contained no more in Specie than Three *Attic* Drachms, or *Roman* Denares; as plainly

plainly appears from (o) *Ariſtotle*, in his now loſt Treatiſe of the *Sicilian Government*. And the words of *Feſtus* are moſt expreſs; *Talentorum non unum genus: Atticum eſt ſex millium denarium, Syracuſanum trium denariûm.* What an immenſe difference! One *Attic* Talent had the real value of Two Thouſand *Sicilian* Talents. Now, in all theſe Epiſtles the very Circumſtances aſſure us, that by the word *Talent* ſimply named, the *Attic* Talent is underſtood. But ſhould not our wiſe Sophiſt have known, that a *Talent*, in that Country where he had laid the Scene of his Letters, was quite another thing? Without queſtion, if the true *Phalaris* had penn'd them, he would have reckoned theſe Summs by the *Sicilian* Talents, encreaſing only the Number: Or ſhould he have made uſe of the *Attic* Accompt, he would always have given expreſs notice of it; never ſaying τάλαντον alone, without the addition of Ἀττικόν.

(o) *Pollux*, lib.ix. c.6.

XV. But to let paſs all further arguments from Words and Language; to me the very Matter and Buſineſs of the Letters ſufficiently diſcovers them to be an Impoſture. What force of Wit and Spirit in the Stile, what lively painting of Humour, ſome fanſie they diſcern there; I will not examine nor diſpute. But me-

thinks little Senſe and Judgment is ſhown in the Ground-work and Subject of them. What an improbable and abſurd ſtory is that of the LIV ? *Steſichorus* was born at *Himera*; but he chanced to die at *Catana*, a hundred miles diſtance from home, quite acroſs the Iſland. (*p*) There he was buried, and a noble Monument made for him. Thus far the Sophiſt had read in good Authors. Now upon this he introduces the *Himerenſes*, ſo enraged at the others for having *Steſichorus*'s Aſhes, that nothing leſs will ſerve them, than denouncing of War, and ſacking their City. And preſently an Embaſſy is ſent to *Phalaris*, to deſire his aſſiſtance: who, like a generous Allye, promiſes them what Arms and Men and Money they would: but withal, ſprinkles a little duſt among the Bees, adviſing them to milder counſels, and propoſing this expedient, That *Catana* ſhould have *Steſichorus*'s Tomb, and *Himera* ſhould build a Temple to him. Now, was ever any Declamator's Theme ſo extravagantly put? What? to go to War upon ſo ſlight an occaſion? and to call in too the aſſiſtance of the Tyrant? Had they ſo ſoon forgot *Steſichorus*'s own counſel? (*q*) who, when upon another occaſion they would have asked ſuccour of *Phalaris*, diſſuaded them by

(p) *Suidas* Πάντα ὀ-πτώ. & Στησιχ.

(q) *Ariſtot. Rhet.* l. ii.

by the Fable of the *Horſe* and his *Rider*. Our Sophiſt had heard, that Seven Cities *contended* about *Homer*; and ſo Two might go to Blows about another Poet. But there's a difference between that Contention, and this Fighting in Earneſt. He is as extravagant too in the Honours he would raiſe to his Poet's Memory; nothing leſs than a Temple and Deification. *Cicero* tells us, that in his days, there was his Statue ſtill extant at *Himera* (then called *Thermæ*,) which, one would think, was Honour enough. But a Sophiſt can build Temples in the Air, as cheaply and eaſily as ſome others do Caſtles.

What an inconſiſtency is there between the LI and LXIX Epiſtles? In the former he declares his immortal hatred to one *Python*, who, after *Phalaris*'s flight from *Aſtypalæa*, would have perſuaded his Wife *Erythia* to a ſecond marriage with himſelf; but ſeeing her reſolved to follow her Husband, he poiſon'd her. Now this could be no long time after his baniſhment; for then ſhe could not have wanted Opportunities of following him. But in the LXIX Epiſt. we have her alive again, long after that *Phalaris* had been Tyrant of *Agrigentum*; for he mentions his growing old there. And we muſt not imagine, but that ſeveral years had paſſed, before he

he could ſeize the Government of ſo populous a City, that had (*r*) 200,000 Souls in it, or, as others (*s*) ſay, 800,000. For he came an indigent Stranger thither, according to the Letters; and by degrees riſing from one employment to another, at laſt had opportunity and power to effect that deſign. Beſides, in the LXIX Letter, ſhe is at *Crete* with her Son; and in the LI, ſhe is poiſon'd (I ſuppoſe) at *Aſtypalæa*: for there her Poiſoner dwelt; and 'tis expreſly ſaid, ſhe deſign'd, but could not follow her Husband. Which ſeems an intimation, that the Sophiſt believed *Aſtypalæa* to be a City in *Crete*. 'Tis certain, our diligent Editors by comparing theſe two paſſages together, made that diſcovery (*t*) in Geography: for it could not be learnt any where elſe; and 'tis an admirable token, both that the Epiſtles are old and genuine, and that the Commentators are not inferior to, nor unworthy of their Author.

(*r*) *Diod. Sicul.* p. 205.

(*s*) *Diog. Laert. in Empedoc.*

(*t*) *Vita Phalar. & Index.*

What a ſcene of putid and ſenſeleſs formality are the LXXIIX, LXXIX, and CXLIV Epiſtles? *Nicocles* a *Syracuſian*, a Man of the higheſt rank and quality, ſends his own Brother an hundred miles with a requeſt to *Phalaris*, That He would ſend to *Steſichorus* another hundred miles, and beg the favour of a Copy of Verſes upon *Cleariſta* his Wife, who was lately dead.

dead. *Phalaris* accordingly ſends to *Himera* with mighty application and addreſs, and ſoon after writes a ſecond Letter of Thanks for ſo ſingular a Kindneſs. Upon the fame of this, one (*u*) *Pelopidas* entreats him, That he would procure the like favour for a friend of His ; but meets with a repulſe. Now, whether there was any Poem upon *Clearista* among the Works of *Steſichorus*, whence our Sophiſt might take the Plot and Ground-work of this ſtory ; or whether all is entirely his own invention and manufacture ; I will not pretend to gueſs. But let thoſe believe that can, that ſuch ſtuff as this buſied the head of the Tyrant : at leaſt they muſt confeſs then, though the Letters would repreſent him as a great admirer and judge too of Poetry, that he was a mere *Aſinus ad Lyram*. For, in the LXXIX Epiſt. he calls this Poem upon *Clearista* μέλος and μελῳδίαν, which muſt here (as it almoſt ever does) ſignifie a *Lyric Ode*, ſince it is ſpoken of *Steſichorus* a Melic or Lyric Poet. But in the CXLIV he calls it an *Elegy*, ἔλεγεῖον ; which is as different from μέλος, as *Theognis* is from *Pindar*, or *Tibullus* from *Horace*. What ? the ſame Copy of Verſes both an Ode and an Elegy ? Could not ſome years acquaintance with *Steſichorus* teach him the very Names ? But to forgive Him, or rather

(*u*) Ep. lxv.

the

the Sophiſt, ſuch an egregious piece of Dulneſs; why, forſooth, ſo much adoe, why ſuch a vaſt way about, to obtain a few Verſes? Could not they have writ directly to *Steſichorus*, and at the price of ſome Preſent have met with eaſie ſucceſs? Do not we know, that all of that String, *Bacchylides*, *Simonides*, *Pindar*, got their livelyhood by the *Muſes*? So that to uſe *Phalaris*'s interceſſion; beſides the delay, and an unneceſſary trouble to both, was to defraud the Poet of his Fee.

Nay certainly, they might have employed any hand, rather than *Phalaris*'s. For, begging pardon of the Epiſtles, I ſuſpect all to be a Cheat, about *Steſichorus*'s friendſhip with him. For the Poet, out of common gratitude, muſt needs have celebrated it in ſome of his Works. But that he *did not*, the Letters themſelves are, in this point, a ſufficient witneſs. For, in the LXXIX, *Phalaris* is feigned to entreat him, not once to mention his Name in his Books. This was a ſly fetch of our Sophiſt, to prevent ſo ſhrewd an objection from *Steſichorus*'s ſilence as to any friendſhip at all with him. But that cunning ſhall not ſerve his turn. For what if *Phalaris* had really wiſhed him to decline mentioning his Name? *Steſichorus* knew the World well enough, that thoſe

ſort

ſort of requeſts are but a modeſt ſimulation; and a diſobedience would have been eaſily pardoned. In the LXXIV Letter, he proclaims and glories to his enemy *Orſilochus*, that *Pythagoras* had ſtay'd five Months with him: why ſhould he then ſeek to conceal from Poſterity the twelve Years familiarity with *Steſichorus*? *Pindar*, exhorting *Hiero* the Tyrant of *Syracuſe* to be kind to Poets and Men of letters, tells him how *Cræſus* had immortal praiſe for his friendſhip and bounty to them, *but the* (w) *memory of that cruel and inhoſpitable* Phalaris *was hated and curſed every where.* How could *Pindar* have ſaid this, had he heard of his extraordinary dearneſs with *Steſichorus*? For their acquaintance, according to the Letters, was as memorable and as glorious, as that of *Cræſus* with *Æſop* and *Solon*. So that *Pindar*, had he known it, for that ſole kindneſs to his fellow Poet, would have forborn ſo vile a character. *Plato*, in his Second Epiſtle, recounts to *Dionyſius* ſome celebrated friendſhips of learned Men with Tyrants and Magiſtrates; *Simonides*'s with *Hiero* and *Pauſanias*, *Thales*'s with *Periander*, *Anaxagoras*'s with *Pericles*, *Solon*'s and others with *Cræſus*. Now, how could he have miſſed, had he ever heard of it, this of *Steſichorus* with *Phalaris*? being tranſacted in *Sicily*, and ſo a moſt proper

(w) *Pyth.* 1. Τὸν Φάλαριν χαλκέῳ καυτῆρι ἐκ νηλέα νόον Ἔχθεϊ. Φάλαιν κατέχει πάντα φάτις.

proper and domeſtic Example. If you ſay, the infamy of *Phalaris* made him decline that odious inſtance: in that very word you pronounce our Epiſtles to be ſpurious. For if They had been known to *Plato*, even *Phalaris* would have appeared as moderate a Tyrant as *Dionyſius* himſelf. (x) *Lucian*, that feigns an Embaſſy from *Phalaris* to *Delphi* for the dedication of the Brazen Bull, makes an Oration in his Praiſe, as *Iſocrates* does of *Buſiris*; where, without doubt, he has gathered all the ſtories he knew for Topics of his commendation: but he has not one word of his friendſhip with *Steſichorus*. Nor, indeed, has any body elſe. And do not you yet begin to ſuſpect the credit of the Letters?

(x) *In Phalar. prior.*

It would be endleſs to proſecute this part, and ſhew all the ſillineſs and impertinency in the Matter of the Epiſtles. For, take them in the whole bulk; if a Great Perſon would give me leave, I ſhould ſay, they are a fardle of Common Places, without any life or ſpirit from Action and Circumſtance. Do but caſt your eye upon *Cicero*'s Letters, or any States-man's, as *Phalaris* was: what lively characters of Men there! what deſcriptions of Place! what notifications of Time! what particularity of Circum-

Circumſtances! what multiplicity of Deſigns and Events! When you return to theſe again, you feel, by the emptineſs and deadneſs of them, that you converſe with ſome dreaming Pedant with his elbow on his desk; not with an active, ambitious Tyrant, with his Hand on his Sword, commanding a Million of Subjects. All that takes or affects you, is, a ſtiffneſs and ſtatelineſs and operoſeneſs of Stile: but as that is improper and unbecoming in all Epiſtles, ſo eſpecially it is quite aliene from the character of *Phalaris*, a man of buſineſs and diſpatch.

XVI. It muſt needs be a great wonder to thoſe that think the Letters genuine; how or where they were conceal'd, in what ſecret Cave, or unknown Corner of the World; ſo that no body ever heard of them for a thouſand years together. Some truſty Servant of the Tyrant muſt have buried them under ground; and it was well that he did ſo. For if the *Agrigentines* had met with them, they had certainly gone to pot. They that burnt alive both Him, and his Relations, and his Friends; would never have ſpared ſuch monuments of him, to ſurvive Them and their City. And without doubt it was immortal Vellum, and ſtoln from the (*y*) *Parchments of Jove*; that could laſt

(*y*) Διφθέραι Διός.

laſt for ten Ages, though untouch'd and unſtirr'd; in ſpight of all damp and moiſture, that moulders other mortal skins. For had our Letters been uſed or tranſcribed during that thouſand years; ſome body would ſurely have ſpoken of them. Eſpecially ſince ſo many of the Ancients had occaſion to do ſo: ſo that their ſilence is a direct argument that they never had heard of them. I have juſt now cited ſome paſſages of *Pindar*, *Plato*, and *Lucian*; which are a plain indication, that they were unknown to thoſe Three. Nay, the laſt of theſe, beſides the proof above-named from his ſilence and prætermiſſion, does as good as declare expreſsly, that he never ſaw our Epiſtles. For, not to mention other differences of leſs moment, he makes both (z) *Phalaris*, and his Smith *Perilaus*, to be born at *Agrigentum*; but the Letters bring one of them from *Aſtypalæa*, and the other from *Athens*. *Lucian* then knew nothing of them; or at leaſt knew them, as I do, to be ſpurious, and below his notice. Much leſs could he be the Author of them, as *Politian* and his followers believe; for he would neither have been guilty of ſuch flat Contradictions; nor have ſo forfeited all Learning and Wit, by thoſe groſs blunders in Chronology, and that wretched pedantry

(z) *Phalar.* 1. Ἐγὼ γὰρ ὁ περὶ ἀφανῶν ἐν Ἀκραγάντῳ ὤν. & ibid. Περίλαος ἦν τις ἡμεδαπός.

pedantry in the Matter. And whoſoever thoſe Authors were, that *Lucian* followed, in his Narrative of *Phalaris*; They too are ſo many Witneſſes againſt the Epiſtles. One can hardly believe, indeed, that the Sophiſt ſhould venture to fetch his Tyrant from *Aſtypalæa*, without the warrant of ſome old Writer. But yet *Lucian* and his Authors compell us to think ſo. And we find him as fool-hardy on other occaſions. (*a*) *Heraclides* of *Pontus*, that lived within two Centuries of *Phalaris*'s Age, ſays, the *Agrigentines*, when they recovered their Liberty, burnt Him and his Mother: but our Sophiſt makes him an Orphan, (*b*) ὀρφανίας πεπεζεῆναι; which if any one ſhall contend to mean the loſs of his Father only, yet ſtill He and *Heraclides* will not ſet horſes together. For if *Phalaris* fled alone from *Aſtypalæa*, neither Wife nor Child nor any Relation following him, according to the Letters; how came the Old Woman to be roaſted at *Agrigentum*? (*c*) *Jamblichus* brings in *Abaris* the Hyperborean in company with *Pythagoras*, to *Phalaris*'s Court: But our Sophiſt has writ a (*d*) Letter for him, wherein he refuſes to come. So little regard had he, to fit his ſtories to true Hiſtory: and I have had too much regard to him, in giving him the Honour and Patience of ſo long an Examination.

(*a*) *De Polit.* ἐνέστρησε ὁ κύων μητέρα.

(*b*) Epiſt. xlix.

(*c*) *Vita Pythag.* p. 183.

(*d*) Epiſt. lvii.

I MUST now beg the favour of one word with our late Editors of this Author. They have told the world, in their Preface, That (among other Specimens of their Diligence) they collated the King's MS. as far as the XL Epiſtle; and would have done ſo throughout, but that the Library Keeper, (e) *out of his ſingular Humanity*, denied them the further uſe of it. This was meant as a Laſh for Me, who had the Honour then and ſince to ſerve His Majeſty in that Office. I muſt own, 'twas very very reſolv'd of them, to make the Preface and the Book all of a piece; for they have acted in this Calumny both the injuſtice of the Tyrant, and the forgery of the Sophiſt. For my own part, I ſhould never have honour'd it with a Refutation in Print, but have given it the Neglect that is due to Weak Detraction; had I not been engaged to my Friend, to write this Cenſure upon *Phalaris*; where to omit to take notice of that Slander, would be tacitly to own it. The true ſtory is thus: A Bookſeller came to me, in the name of the Editors, to beg the uſe of the Manuſcript. It was not then in my cuſtody: but as ſoon as I had the power of

(e) Præf. Phalar. Edit. Oxon. *Manuſcripto in Bibliotheca Regia, cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius pro ſingulari ſua humanitate negavit.*

of it, I went voluntarily and offer'd it him; bidding him tell the Collator not to loſe any time; for I was ſhortly to go out of Town for two Months. 'Twas deliver'd, uſed, and return'd. Not a word ſaid by the Bearer, nor the leaſt ſuſpicion in me, that they had not finiſh'd the collation. For, I ſpeak from experiment, they had more Days to compare it in, than they needed to have Hours. 'Tis a very little Book, and the Writing as legible as Print. Well, the Collation, it ſeems, was ſent defective to *Oxon*; and the blame, I ſuppoſe, laid upon Me. I return'd again to the Library, ſome months before the Edition was finiſh'd: No application was made for further uſe of the Manuſcript. Thence I went for a whole fortnight to *Oxon*, where the Book was then printing; converſed in the very College where the Editors reſided. Not the leaſt whiſper there of the Manuſcript. After a few weeks, out comes the new Edition, with this Sting in the Mouth of it. 'Twas a ſurprize, indeed, to read there, that our Manuſcript was not peruſed. Could not they have ask'd for it again, then, after my return? 'Twas neither *ſingular*, nor common *Humanity*, not to enquire into the truth of the thing; before they ventur'd to Print, which is a Sword in the

Hand of a Child. But there is a reaſon for every thing; and the myſtery was ſoon revealed. As for the King's Manuſcript, they had no want nor deſire of it; for, as I ſhall ſhew by and by, they had neither induſtry nor skill to uſe either That or their Own. And for my part; I, it ſeems, had the hard hap, in ſome private converſation, to ſay the *Epiſtles* were a ſpurious Piece, and unworthy of a new Edition. *Hinc illæ lachrimæ.* This was a thing deeply reſented; and to have ſpoken to me about the Manuſcript, had been to loſe a plauſible occaſion of taking revenge.

Pro ſingulari ſua humanitate! I could produce ſeveral Letters from learned Profeſſors abroad, whoſe Books our Editors may in time be fit to read; wherein theſe very ſame words are ſaid of me candidly and ſeriouſly. For I endeavour to oblige even Foreigners by all Courteſie and Humanity; much more would I encourage and aſſiſt any uſeful Deſigns at home. And I heartily wiſh, that I could do any ſervice to that young Gentleman of great Hopes, whoſe Name is ſet to the Edition. I can do him no greater at preſent, than to remove ſome blemiſhes from the Book that is aſcribed to him: which I deſire may be taken aright; to be no diſparagement to himſelf, but a reproof only to his Teachers.

It

It is counted an ill Omen to ſtumble at the Threſhold. In the very Firſt Epiſtle to *Alcibous*, we have theſe words, Ψυχῆς ᾗ νόσον ἰαλεὸς ἰᾶται θάναλος· ὃν ἀνεπαχθέσαλον ἀντὶ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἀδικημάτων, ὧν ἀκουσίων ὧν ἐμοὶ προσῆκες, ἀλλ' ἑκουσίων ὧν αὐτὸς εἰργάσω προσδέχου: that is, *For a diſeaſe of the Soul, the only Phyſician is Death: do you therefore expect a moſt painful one for thoſe many and great injuſtices, not involuntary ones, ſuch as you accuſe Me of, but voluntary ones that your ſelf have committed.* Let us ſee now, how our new Editors have managed this paſſage. Firſt, they interpret ἀνεπαχθέσαλον, *nulli gravem:* meaning, I ſuppoſe, that *Alcibous*'s death would be grievous to no body. Which not only produces a flat and farfetcht ſenſe, but is contrary to the rules of good Language. For the *Greek* is in the Superlative degree: let them put it then *nulli graviſſimam*; and it will ſhew them the errror of their Verſion. It will be evident to ſuch as know propriety of Speech, that ἀνεπαχθέσαλον, ſince no Dative Caſe follows it, muſt be referred to *Alcibous*, and to no body elſe. I do not expect from our Editors much ſagacity in way of Critic: but though they could not of themſelves find out the true Reading; yet methinks they might have em-

braced it, when they ſaw it in the Manuſcript; which reads it, ὃν ἂν ἐπαχθέσταλον, *a moſt grievous and cruel death*; meaning that in the Brazen Bull; which he calls, in the CXXII Epiſt. ὄλεθρον ἀχθηρόταλον, an epithet of the ſame root and ſignification. Ἄν in this place, is an expletive particle, παραπληρωματικόν, as the Grammarians call it; which being a rare and quaint uſage, was the cauſe of corrupting the Text.

The next words in the ſame paſſage, ἀδικημάτων, οὐκ ἀκουσίων, our elegant Interpreters render *ſcelera, non invita.* And this we are to receive for one of their many (*f*) improvements after the former Tranſlators. Thoſe Old ones, good honeſt Men, put us off with plain country Latin, *Scelera, non præter voluntatem patrata*, and other ſuch Periphraſes. For, as it was in their days believed, ἄκων ſignified *unwilling*, and was always meant of the Agent: ἀκούσιον was *involuntary*, and generally meant of the Action. And this latter, when it ſignifies the Action, cannot be expreſſed in Latin by one ſingle word. For *Involuntarius* was not in uſe: and *Invitus* is the ſame with ἄκων, and is always ſpoken of the Perſon, never of the Thing. So that if any body elſe had ſaid *ſcelera invita, unwilling Crimes*; ſome bold

(*f*) *Præf.* P. 3.

bold Readers would be apt to take it for Barbariſm and Nonſenſe: but coming from thoſe great Genius's, with whom Learning, that is a leaving the world, has taken her laſt reſidence, they receive this as a new diſcovery in Language; like (g) another of theirs in Geography.

(g) *Sup.* p. 44.

In the very next words to theſe, ἀκουσίων, ὧν ἐμοὶ παρῄνεις; let us ſee if they make any better work there. *Invita, ad quæ me hortaris*; *Involuntary Crimes, to which you exhort me*, ſays the verſion of our late Editors. Admirably well done again! Pray, how can this *Alcibous*, a *Meſſenian*, be ſaid to *exhort* him to thoſe Cruelties, who ſo much abhorred Him and Them, (as it is in this very Letter,) that he had the Phyſician his Townſman tried for his own Life, for ſaving the Tyrant's? It would puzzle a common Wit to reconcile this; but here's a Note upon this paſſage, that will ſet every thing aright. (h) *Ad quæ me hortaris*;] i. e. *Moribus tuis nequiſſimis provocas.* Commend me to theſe Annotators for a help at a dead lift. *To provoke a Man*, we ſee, *with the baſeſt tricks*, is, in their language, to *exhort* him. So that when They, by a vile aſperſion, inſtead of thanks for a kindneſs receiv'd, have given me juſt *provocation* to anſwer them as they de-

(h) *Annot. ad Phalar.* p. 145.

ſerve ; it is only, in their manner, to *exhort* me to do it. It is my *ſingular Humanity*, that I do not follow their Exhortation. But I am apt to believe, that even the Sophiſt himſelf, as illiterate as he was, would diſdain to own ſuch a verſion to be the Echo of his meaning. Had he had in his thoughts ſo ridiculous a ſenſe as they father upon him ; he would have ſaid then, εἰς ἃ, or, ἐφ' ἃ ἐμὲ προτρέπεις. For that is the Syntax of προτρέπω, when it ſignifies to *exhort*. Whereas ἃ ἐμοὶ προτρέπεις (the ὧν in the Text is for ἃ) is, in that ſenſe, as abſurd and incongruous in *Greek* ; as *Quæ mihi hortaris*, or, *Quæ mihi provocas* would be in *Latin*. I think I have ſhewn already, that προτρέπειν is here ὀνειδίζειν, *exprobrare*, to accuſe and reproach : *Thoſe involuntary wrongs, that you lay to my charge.* 'Tis true, the word is not uſed in this acceptation by any ancient Authors. I have mention'd it therefore above, as a token of a more recent Writer. But without doubt it was of known uſe in the age of the Sophiſt ; and the innovation was not at all improper. For as the Ancients, both in Poetry and Proſe, uſed προφέρειν to denote this meaning ;

Ταῦτά μοι προφέρεις, κάλλιον ὄνειδος ἐπάινων.

ſo

ſo by a like metaphor and analogy, we may uſe περιτρέπειν to expreſs the ſame notion: juſt as the Latins ſay, *vitio* VERTERE. All this, I ſuppoſe, was known to the Tranſlator of *Phalaris*, who is commonly, but, I believe, falſly ſuppoſed to be *Cujacius*; for he interprets it very well, *Cujuſmodi mihi objicis.* But that Edition, and another of *Aldus*, tho' the two principal of all, and both of them in the public Library at *Oxon*, had yet the odd fortune to lie all the while conceal'd (*i*), from our late Editors that lived there.

(*i*) *Præf.* p. 3.

I was, but juſt now, in the mind to oblige them, by going through their whole Book, and correcting for them all the Faults, that give offence to the beſt Readers. But now, that I caſt my eye backwards, it makes me look as blank, at the proſpect of all that's to come; as *Hercules* did, when, after he had made a bargain unſeen, he ſaw the Stables of *Augeas*. For if the very Firſt Epiſtle, of nine Lines only, has taken me up four Pages in ſcouring; what a ſweet piece of work ſhould I have of it, to cleanſe all the reſt for them? I muſt beg their Excuſe therefore for the preſent; and ſhall only, to keep my Promiſe, give one Touch of their induſtry and skill, in making uſe of the Manuſcript.

They

They have confeſſed to us, they collated the Manuſcript to the (*k*) XL Epiſtle. But, it ſeems, they could make no uſe of its various Lections, but in one ſingle place, Epiſt. XXVI. It is writ to one *Ariphrades*, to caution his Son to leave off plotting againſt *Phalaris* ; ἵνα, ὅταν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γένηται τῷ κακῷ διαλέιπων ἐν οἷς ἔχει, μὴ προσποιηθῇ δοκεῖν ἠγνοηκέναι ; *leſt, when puniſhment overtakes him for perſiſting in his preſent courſes, he pretend he had not fair warning.* But what now do our new Editors make of this ? διαλέιπων ἐν οἷς ἔχει, they tranſlate, *ſuam expendens conditionem.* This puts me in mind of the old *Greek* Proverb, *That* Leucon *carries one thing, and his Aſs quite another.* For here's no affinity at all between the Text and the Verſion ; which would every whit as well agree to any other words in the Book. Even our Editors themſelves ſeem ſenſible of this ; for they give us this Note upon it, (*l*) *That* διαλέιπω *cannot admit here of any other meaning : and yet they find it no where elſe uſed in this ſenſe.* I dare paſs my word for the truth of this latter part : to the former I ſhall ſay more anon. *So that*, ſay they, *the better Reading is in the King's Manuſcript,* διὰ τίνων

(*k*) *Præf.* P. 4.

(*l*) Διαλέιπω *alium ſenſum hic vix admittit. in eodem tamen uſurpatum nullibi invenio. Melius itaque in MS. Regio* διὰ τίνων ἐν οἷς ἔχει, *ob ea quæ jam agit.* Annotat. pag. 146.

διὰ τίνων ἐν οἷς ἔϛι, i. e. *for thoſe things which he now does.* In the King's Manuſcript, which I have now by me, it was written at firſt, διατείνων: but another Hand has raſed out the ε, as appears by the void ſpace, and made it διά τινων. This Corrector, whoever he was, though we know him from hence to be a ſorry Critic; yet he was a degree above our new Editors. For he made his τινων an Enclitic; but they theirs an Interrogative, as we ſee by their Accent. Which in this place is directly againſt either common Grammar, or common Senſe; chuſe whether they pleaſe. But the genuine lection and meaning is, as I rendred it above; διαλείνων ἐν οἷς ἔϛι, *perſiſting and proceeding in his preſent ways.* So in the xxxix Epiſt. μένων ἐν οἷς ἔϛι, *continuing in the preſent ſtation.* 'Tis true, our Editors will not find διαλείνων thus rendred in their Dictionaries: but they may pleaſe to enlarge them then from this very place. For, is not διαλείνω exactly the ſame as the Latin PERTENDO? And is not *Pertendo,* to *perſiſt and perſevere?*

(m) *Verum ſi incipies, neque pertendes naviter.* (m) Ter. Eunuch. I, 1.

Even the Verſion aſcribed to *Cujacius* has here the true interpretation, *Perſiſtens in propoſito*: which I would adviſe our Editors

tors to conſult, when they deſign to oblige the world by another Edition.

This is all the uſe they have made of the King's Manuſcript: let us ſee if they have been more diligent in their own. In the XXXIV Epiſt. the Tyrant tells one *Pollux*, who wonder'd he was grown ſo recluſe, and difficult of acceſs; ἐγὼ δ' ἐνδεέστερον ἤδη φεύγω πάντας ἀνθρώπους: *Nay*, ſays he, *I avoid company leſs than I ought to do; for I have found no faith either among ſtrangers or friends.* Our new Interpreters have given us here a caſt of their Critic; for (*n*) inſtead of ἐνδεέστερον they venture to read ἐκτενέστερον, *ego jam* ſedulo *omnes fugio*: as for the former Lection, they confeſs they know not what to make on't. Here are your Work-men to mend an Author; as bungling Tinkers do old Kettles: there was but one hole in the Text before they medled with it, but they leave it with two. For the fault is not in ἐνδεέστερον, but in ἤδη; which is to be corrected ἢ δεῖ: ἐνδεέστερον ἢ δεῖ, *minus quam par eſt, minus quam oportet.* This is ſo very eaſie an Emendation, that a ſmall doſe of ſagacity might have found it out, by conjecture. But what will the Men of Letters think of our Editors? will they commend their skill or their induſtry moſt? when I aſſure them, that all the Three Manuſcripts

(*n*) *Legendum forſan* ἐκτενέστερον, *quam enim interpretationem* ἐνδεέστερον *hic admittat, non video.*

nuſcripts which they pretend to have collated, have it plainly and fairly ἢ δεῖ. Which fault will the Editors plead to? to make a public boaſt of collating Three Manuſcripts, and yet neglect every one of them? or, to have obſerved in the Manuſcripts ſo certain a Correction, without either knowledge to make uſe on't themſelves, or ingenuity to communicate it to the world? 'Tis a bad buſineſs on either ſide; and yet it receives a great aggravation from this other which follows. Epiſt. LXVIII. *Phalàris*, to encourage his Son's Bounty; *I do not think*, ſays he, *you ſpend me too much money*, ἀλλ' ἐμαυτὸν ἐνδεέστερον εὐεῖσθαι ἢ δι' ἡλικίαν παιδὸς ἀνάρχειν; *but I rather think I allow you too ſparingly, for ſo generous a Son.* Here is ἐνδεέστερον ἢ comes again. Now, every one of the Manuſcripts have it here too ἢ δεῖ: Two of which, they pretend, in their Preface, to have throughly collated. And yet they take not the leaſt notice of this plain Emendation, ἐνδεέστερον ἢ δεῖ, *parcius æquo, parcius quam oportet*; but blunder on with the vulgar Reading, and tranſlate it, (*o*) *But I find my ſelf too poor to ſupply your Liberality.* Which, beſides that it does not anſwer the words of the *Greek*, (which would then have been, ἢ, ἢ ἀρκεῖ.) makes mere non-

(*o*) *Ego me pauperiorem invenio, quàm ut filii benignitati ſufficere poſſim.*

nonſenſe of the Context. For in the very next ſentence, he tells his Son; *You ſhall ſooner want friends to give it to, than I want money to give.* Ingenious Tranſlators! to make him complain of Poverty, and in the ſame breath to declare that he has Riches without end.

Let this ſerve for a ſhort Specimen of their Care and Skill in uſing of Manuſcripts. I have many more inſtances ready at hand; but their *Humanity*, I hope, will pardon me, if I don't produce them now; nor now proceed, as I once thought, to weed all their Book for them. My Time does not lie upon my hands; and this Tract muſt be only a ſhort Appendix to the Book of my Friend: but it's likely hereafter, if, in their way of ſpeaking, they mightily *exhort* me to it; I may be at their ſervice; if not in this, yet in another Language: to carry the fame and glory of our Editors, whither ſuch Editions as theirs ſeldom go, to foreign Univerſities.

OF

OF THEMISTOCLES's EPISTLES.

SIR,

I Preſume I have been as good as my word, in detecting the cheat of *Phalaris*'s *Epiſtles*: the other part of my Promiſe was a Cenſure of *Æſop*'s *Fables*. But before I meddle with thoſe, I am willing, now that my Hand's in, to examine ſome other Impoſtures of this ſort, out of the ſame Schools of the Sophiſts. It will be no unpleaſant labour to me, nor, I hope, unprofitable to others, to pull off the diſguiſe from thoſe little Pedants, that have ſtalked about ſo long in the apparel of Hero's.

The *Epiſtles of Themiſtocles* were printed firſt at *Rome*, in MDCXXVI, out of a Manuſcript in the *Vatican*. The Editor, a *Greek* Biſhop, believed them genuine; but there were ſome that ſuſpected a Forgery, as (*p*) *Leo Allatius* informs us: who himſelf leaves the matter in doubt; but withal obſerves in their favour, that no body had ever ſaid a word in print, to prove them to be ſpurious. (*q*) *Suidas* is

(*p*) *De Script. Socrat.* p. 78.

(*q*) *V.* Θεμιστοκ.

is an Evidence in their behalf; for, ſpeaking of their reputed Author, he ſays, *he has writ Letters full of Spirit*, ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς φρονήματος καὶ γεμούσας. He, I think, is the only old Writer that makes any mention of them. Which alone, as before in *Phalaris*'s caſe, is a ſhrewd prejudice againſt their Credit and Reputation.

(r) Lib. 1. p. 90. (r) *Thucydides* and *Charon Lampſacenus* ſay that *Themiſtocles*, when he fled into *Aſia*, made his addreſs to *Artaxerxes*, who was newly come to the Throne; wherein they are followed by (s) *Cornelius Nepos* and *Plutarch*; againſt the common tradition of *Ephorus*, *Heraclides*, and moſt others, that make *Xerxes* the Father to be then alive. Some (t) Writers relate, that he had five Cities given him by the *Perſian*; others, but three. Now, if the Letters had been known to any of thoſe Authors, both theſe Diſputes had been ſoon at an end, or rather never had been raiſed. For he himſelf expreſly ſays, (u) it was *Xerxes* he went to, and that he gave him but three Cities. Now, where could theſe Epiſtles lie, unknown and inviſible from *Themiſtocles*'s time to *Suidas*? We muſt needs ſay, that the Letters had a worſe Exoſtraciſm than their Author: ſince he was baniſht but for five Years, but they for a Thouſand.

(s) *Vita Themiſtoc.*

(t) *Plutarch, Diodor. Athenæus*, &c.

(u) Ep. xx.

'Tis

II. 'Tis obſervable, That every one of the Letters bear date after his baniſhment; and contain a compleat Narrative of all his Story afterwards, without the leaſt gap or interruption. Now 'tis hard to ſay, whether is the more ſtrange of the two; That not one ſingle Letter of his, before that time, ſhould be preſerved; or not one, afterwards, loſt, though written from ſo diſtant places, *Argos*, *Corcyra*, *Epirus*, *Epheſus*, *Magneſia*, from whence there was no very ſure conveyance to *Athens*. What a croſs viciſſitude of Fortune! while the Author is in Proſperity, all his Letters are unlucky; and not one of them is miſſing, after he himſelf miſcarried. But the Sophiſt can eaſily account for this, though *Themiſtocles* cannot: for here are no Letters before his Exile; becauſe the latter part of his Life was the whole Tour and Compaſs that the Sophiſt deſigned to write of: and not a Letter afterwards periſhed; becauſe being forged in a Sophiſt's Cloſet, they run no hazard at all of being loſt in the carriage.

III. *Themiſtocles* was an Eloquent Man; but here are ſome touches in his Letters of ſuch an elevated ſtrain, that if he did not go to School to *Gorgias Leontinus* the Sophiſt of that time, I can hardly believe he writ them. The Hiſtorians tell us mo-

derately, That after he was driven from home, he was made much on at *Argos*: but He himſelf is all melting, when he talks on that Subject. (*w*) He was met, he ſays, on the road by two *Argivans* of his acquaintance; who, when he told them the news of his Baniſhment, rail'd bitterly at the *Athenians*: but when they heard he was going to *Delphi*, rather than to Their town; in a kind quarrel they tell him, That (*x*) *the* Athenians *had juſtly puniſhed him*; ſince he ſo much wronged the City of *Argos*, to think of any Sanctuary but that. Well, he goes with them to *Argos*; and there the whole City (*y*) *teazes him by mere force* to take the *Government* upon him; taking it as the greateſt *injury*, that he offer'd to decline it. Theſe, you'll ſay, are choice flowers both of Courteſy and of Rhetoric: but there's another clearly beyond them; where he tells us, (*z*) That he is ſo reſolved of going to the *Perſian* Court, though it was a deſperate riſque; *that neither the Advice of his Friends, nor his Father* Neocles's *Ghoſt, nor his Uncle* Themiſtocles's, *nor Augury, nor Omen, nor* Apollo's *Oracle it ſelf, ſhould be able to diſſuade him.* Here's a bold reſolute Blade for you! here's your Stoical κέκευα! 'Tis almoſt impoſſible for a Sophiſt not to betray him-

(*w*) Ep. i.

(*x*) Ἐπαινεῖν Ἀθηναίους, ὡς δίκαια πονόντων ἡμῶν.

(*y*) Ἀναγκάζουσιν, ὡς ἀδικούμενοι, ἢν μὴ ἄρχωμεν.

(*z*) Ep. xiv.

himſelf. Nothing will reliſh and go down with them, that is ordinary and natural. Then they applaud themſelves moſt, when they have ſaid a forced, extravagant thing. If one ſpeaks of any Civility; the Complement muſt be ſtrain'd beyond all Decorum. If he makes a Reſolution; he muſt needs ſwagger and ſwear, and be as willful as a Mad man.

IV. The Subject of many of the Letters is Common place; mere Chat, and telling a Tale, without any Buſineſs; an Errand not worth ſending to the next Town, much leſs to be brought from remote Countries ſome hundreds of Leagues. The xv and xviii Letters are written to Enemies; his Friends, I ſuppoſe, failing in their Correſpondence: and contain nothing but a little Scolding; which was ſcarce worth the long carriage from *Epheſus* to *Athens*.

V. In the xx Epiſtle we have this Story: When *Themiſtocles* was at *Corcyra*, he deſign'd for *Sicily*, to *Gelo* the *Syracuſian* Tyrant. But juſt as he was going a Shipboard, the news came that *Gelo* was dead, and his Brother *Hiero* ſucceeded him. Now, if we make it appear, that *Hiero* was come to the Crown ſome years before *Themiſtocles*'s Baniſhment, and this Voyage to *Corcyra*; what becomes of the

Credit of our Epiſtles? 'Tis true, the Chronology of this part of Hiſtory is not ſo (*a*) ſettled and agreed, as to amount to a Demonſtration againſt the Letters; but however, when joined with the Arguments preceeding, at leaſt it will come up to a high Probability. (*b*) *Theophraſtus*, in his Treatiſe *of Monarchy*, relates, That when *Hiero* had ſent Race-horſes, and a moſt ſumptuous Tent, to the *Olympian* Games; *Themiſtocles* adviſed the *Greeks* to plunder the *Tyrant*'s Tent, τὸν τυράννου, and not to let his Horſes run. 'Tis evident then, if *Theophraſtus* ſpeak properly, that *Hiero* was *Monarch* of *Syracuſe*, when *Themiſtocles* was at *Olympia*; but it's moſt certain he never came thither after his Exile.

(*a*) Οὐδ' αὐτοῖς χρονικοῖς αἴρεμα συνιστᾶσι. *Plut. Them.* p. 227.

(*b*) Περὶ Βασιλείας apud *Plut. Them.* p. 225.

But, to deal fairly, it muſt be confeſſed, that *Ælian*, in telling this ſtory, varies from *Theophraſtus*; for he ſays, (*c*) *Hiero* himſelf came to the Games. But that he would go thither in Perſon, after he got the Government, is wholly improbable. So that, if *Ælian* be believed, this buſineſs muſt have been done, before *Hiero* came to the Throne. For even in *Gelo*'s life-time, who left him the Monarchy, he kept Horſes for the Race; and won at the *Pythian* Games, (*d*) *Pythiad* the XXVI, which anſwers to Olymp. LXXIV. 3. But beſides

(*c*) *Var. Hiſt.* ix, 5.

(*d*) *Pind. Schol. Pyth.* 1, & 3.

beſides that *Theophraſtus* is of much greater authority, the other refutes himſelf in the very next words. For he ſays, *Themiſtocles* hindred *Hiero* upon this pretence; *That he that had not ſhared in the common Danger, ought not to ſhare in the common Feſtival:* where it's certain, by the *common Danger*, he means *Xerxes*'s Expedition; when (*e*) *Gelo* either refuſed or delayed to give the *Greeks* his aſſiſtance. This affront then was put upon *Hiero*, after that Expedition. But the very next (*f*) Olympiad after, *Hiero* was in the Monarchy. It cannot be true then, that his firſt acceſſion to the Throne, was, according to the Letters, while *Themiſtocles* ſtay'd at *Corcyra*.

(*e*) *Herod.* vii. c. 163. *Diod.* xi. p. 21.

(*f*) *Diod.* xi. p. 29.

Beſides theſe Inferences and Deductions, we have the expreſs Verdict and Declaration of moſt of the (*g*) Chronologers, who place the beginning of *Hiero*'s Reign Olymp. LXXV, 3. and *Themiſtocles*'s Baniſhment ſeven years after, Olymp. LXXVII, 2. The *Arundelian* Marble, indeed, differs from all theſe, in the periods of *Gelo* and *Hiero*: which would quite confound all this argumentation from notes of Time. But either that Chronologer is quite out, or we can ſafely believe nothing in Hiſtory. For he makes *Gelo* firſt invade the Government, two years after *Xerxes*'s Expedition.

(*g*) *Scholi. Pind. Pyth.* I. *Diod.* xi. p. 29, 41. *Euſeb. in Chron.*

(*h*)Lib.vii. But (*h*) *Herodotus* ſpends half a dozen pages in the Account of an Embaſſy to *Gelo* from *Sparta* and *Athens*, to deſire his aſſiſtance againſt the *Perſian*. And 'tis agreed among all, (*i*) That *Gelo*'s Victory over the *Carthaginians* in *Sicily* was got the very ſame day with the Battle at *Salamis*.

(*i*)Herodot. ibid. & Diod. l. xi.

VI. The whole Volume of *Themiſtocles*'s Letters conſiſts of XXI only; and Three of theſe are taken up in the ſtory of *Pauſanias*. The Second is writ to *Pauſanias* himſelf, before that *Spartan*'s Conſpiracy with the *Perſian* was diſcovered. There he exhorts him to moderation in his Proſperity; leſt ſome very great turn of Fortune ſhould ſpeedily befall him. Can you deſire now a ſurer indication of a Sophiſt? Without doubt, he that penn'd this Epiſtle, knew beforehand what happen'd to *Pauſanias*: who was ſoon after recall'd home by the Magiſtrates, and put to death for Treaſon. The XIX is to *Pauſanias* again; but after his Conſpiracy was detected. Here he tells the Particulars of that Plot as exactly, as if he had been one of the *Ephori*, that over-heard it. Nay, he foretells him, that the *Lacedæmonians* would take away his life. Now beſides that *Themiſtocles* would ſcorn to inſult ſo, and rail to no purpoſe, as this Letter does; he would ſurely have

had

had more wit, than knowingly to write to the Dead. For at the ſame time he heard thoſe Particulars of *Pauſanias*'s Treaſon, he muſt needs hear of his Execution; ſince thoſe things were not known till after his Death, and the rifling of his Papers. The VI Epiſtle is a long Narrative of the whole buſineſs of *Pauſanias*: for that was a Subject worthy of Eloquence, and therefore was to receive ornament from the Pen of the Sophiſt. But it was ſcarce worthy of *Themiſtocles*, to ſend ſuch a long News-Letter to *Athens*; where, in all likelyhood, the Story was common, before he heard of it himſelf.

But how ſhall we reconcile this Affair of *Pauſanias* according to the Letters, with what *Diodorus* has left us upon the ſame Subject? The Letters, we ſee, make *Themiſtocles* to be baniſht, (*k*) before *Pauſanias* was ſuſpected; and make the one reſide at *Argos*, (*l*) while the other was convicted and put to death. But *Diodorus*, who has brought all his Hiſtory into the method of *Annals*, places the Death of *Pauſanias* (*m*) Olymp. LXXV, 4; and the Exile of *Themiſtocles*, (*n*) ſix years after, Olymp. LXXVII, 2. Now, I would fain know of our Sophiſt, how he came to diſpoſe and ſuit his matters ſo negligently; to bring *Pauſanias* upon the ſtage again, when he had been

(*k*) Ep. ii.

(*l*) Ep. xix. vi.

(*m*) Lib. xi. P. 36.

(*n*) Lib. xi. P. 41.

ſix years in his Grave? I imagine he will referr me to (o) *Thucydides*, who makes an immediate tranſition from one ſtory to the other; 'That the *Spartans* accuſed *Themiſtocles*, who was then baniſht from home, 'of conſpiring with *Pauſanias*.' This, indeed, might draw the Sophiſt and ſome others into a miſtake. But it may be taken two ways: either that it was done preſently, upon the Death of *Pauſanias*; or a few years after, when *Themiſtocles*'s Exile gave the *Spartans*, that hated and fear'd him, an opportunity to ruine him. (p) *Plutarch* follows the firſt way; for he makes *Themiſtocles*, after his Baniſhment, to have private dealings with *Pauſanias*: in which opinion he favours the Author of theſe Letters. But the ſecond will rather appear to be the ſenſe of *Thucydides*: if we conſider, that he places the matter of *Pauſanias* (q) juſt after the flight of *Xerxes*; but when *Themiſtocles* went into *Aſia*, he makes (r) *Artaxerxes* to be in the Throne: which was a conſiderable while after. Beſides that *Diodorus*, whoſe deſign was to referr all Occurrences to Years, and not to follow the thread of Story beyond the annual Period, is of more credit in a point of Chronology; than *Plutarch* or any other, that write Lives by the Lump.

(o) Lib. i. p. 88.

(p) In *Themiſt.* p. 224.

(q) P. 63.

(r) P. 90.

OF

OF SOCRATES's EPISTLES.

THE *Epiſtles* of *Socrates*, and his Scholars, *Xenophon*, *Ariſtippus*, &c. were publiſh'd out of the *Vatican* Library by the Learned *Leo Allatius*; and printed at *Paris*, MDCXXXVII. He was ſo fully perſuaded himſelf, and ſo concerned to have others think, that they are the legitimate Off-ſpring of thoſe Authors they are laid to; that he has guarded and protected them, in a Dialogue of LVII Pages in *quarto*, againſt all the Objections that He or his Friends could raiſe. And no body ſince, that ever I heard of, has brought the matter into controverſie. But I am enclined to believe, that by that time I have done with them, it will be no more a Controverſie, but that they are ſpurious. I ſhall make uſe of nothing that *Allatius* has brought, except one Objection only; and that I ſhall both manage in a new way, and defend it againſt all his Exceptions.

I. The Firſt Letter is *Socrates*'s to ſome King, 'tis ſuppoſed to *Archelaus* King of *Macedonia*; in which he refuſes to go to him,

him, though invited in the most kind and obliging manner. That he really denied his company to *Archelaus* and others, we are assured from very good hands: which was the ground for our Falsary to forge this Epistle. But I believe, none of those that mention it, make so tall a Complement to *Socrates*, as he does here to himself. For he says, (s) *The King offer'd him part of his Kingdom*; and, *that he should not come thither to be commanded, but to command both his Subjects and Himself.* Can you desire a better token of a Sophist, than this? 'Tis a fine offer, indeed, to a poor old Man, that had nothing but his Staff and one Coat to his back. But a Sophist abhorrs mediocrity; he must always say the greatest thing; and make a Tide and a Flood, though it be but in a Bason of Water.

(s) Τῆς βασιλείας ἔφης μέρος δίδοναι. & Ἀρξουλα ἢ τῶν ἄλλων ἢ σὲ αὐτὸν.

II. Well; our Philosopher goes on, and give a reasons of his refusal; That his Dæmon forbid him to go: and then he falls into the long story of what happen'd to him in the Battle at *Delium*; which was a tale of twenty years standing at the date of this Letter. But the Sophist had read it in *Plato*; and he would not miss the opportunity of an eloquent Narration. I will not here insist upon the testimony of (t) *Athenæus*; That the whole business

(t) Lib. v. p. 215.

is

is a mere fiction of *Plato*'s: let that be left in the middle. But we may ſafely inferr thus much from it; That even *Athenæus* himſelf, whoſe curioſity nothing eſcaped, never met with theſe Epiſtles. Which alone creates a juſt ſuſpicion, that they were forged ſince his days; eſpecially when the univerſal ſilence of all Antiquity gives a general conſent to it.

There's a paſſage, indeed, in (x) *Libanius*, which, in *Allatius*'s judgment, ſeems plainly to declare, that he had ſeen this very Epiſtle. For after he had mention'd *Socrates*'s refuſal to go to *Scopas*, and *Eurylochus*, and *Archelaus*; he adds: Αὐτῶν ἤδεσμεν τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν, ἐν ἐκείναις τ' ἄνθρωπον κόλλιστα ἂν ἴδοις. Now ſhould we concede, what *Allatius* would have; this is all that can be inferred from thence in their favour; That they are older than *Libanius*; which I am willing to believe: and, That He believed them true; which I matter not at all. For ſo we have ſeen *Stobæus*, *Suidas* and others, cry up *Phalaris* for a genuine Book; and yet I fanſie none of my Readers are now of their opinion. But with *Allatius*'s good leave, I would draw the words of *Libanius* to a quite contrary purpoſe. After he had ſaid, that many Princes had ſollicited *Socrates*, by Letter, to come and live in their Courts;

(x) *Analogia Socrat.*

and

and he anſwer'd them all with a denial: *But* (ſays he) *I want the Letters themſelves; in which you might perfectly ſee the Spirit of the Man.* This, to me, is an indication, that the Letters he means were not extant. For if he had them in his hand, according to *Allatius*, how could he *want* them? And 'tis plain, he ſpeaks here of ſeveral Letters, being Replies to ſeveral Meſſages; but in this Collection here's but a ſingle one. *I wiſh* (ſays he) *the Letters were to be had; in thoſe you might read his Character.* If this be the ſenſe of thoſe words, as probably it is; *Libanius* is ſo far from being Patron to our Epiſtles, that he is a poſitive Witneſs againſt them.

III. The VII Letter is writ by *Socrates* to one of thoſe that had fled to *Thebes* from the violence of the XXX Tyrants: in which he gives him an account of the ſtate of *Athens* ſince their departure; *That himſelf was now hated by the Tyrants, becauſe he would have no hand in the condemnation of* Leon *the* Salaminian: and then he tells the ſtory at large. Now, here's a manifeſt diſcovery that the Letters are ſuppoſititious. For the buſineſs of *Leon* was quite over, before thoſe Fugitives left the Town. For *Leon* was murder'd (*u*) before *Theramenes* was: and *Theramenes* was murder'd, before

(*u*) *Xenoph. Hiſt.* lib. ii. p. 467, 470. *Diod.* lxiv.

fore *Thraſybulus* and his Party fled to *Thebes*. And that *Socrates* means them in this Letter, 'tis evident from hence; That he ſpeaks here of their Conſpiracy, to reſort privately towards *Athens* and ſet upon the Tyrants: which afterwards came to paſs.

IV. The VIII, IX, XII, and XIII, are Letters of Jeſt and Railery between *Antiſthenes* and *Ariſtippus* and *Simon* the Shoo-maker. 'Tis an affront to the memory of thoſe Men, to believe they would fool and trifle in that manner; eſpecially ſend ſuch impertinent ſtuff as far as from *Sicily* to *Athens*, which could not decently be ſpoken even in merriment at a Table.

V. In the XIII Epiſtle, among the acquaintance of *Simon* he names *Phædrus*, the ſame that gives the Title to the Dialogue of *Plato*: and the XXV is writ by *Phædrus* himſelf to *Plato*: and both theſe are dated after *Socrates*'s death. I will appeal now to *Athenæus*, if theſe two Letters can be genuine. He, among other Errors in Chronology for which he chaſtiſes *Plato*, brings this in for one; (*y*) *That he introduces* Phædrus *diſcourſing with* Socrates; *who muſt certainly be dead before the days of the Philoſopher*. How comes he then to ſurvive him, in theſe Epiſtles; and diſcourſe ſo paſſionately of his Death?

(*y*) Lib. XI. pag. 505. Ἀδύνατον ὃ γὰρ Φαῖδον ἦν καλὰ Σωκρατικῶν εἶναι.

'Tis

'Tis true; for want of ancient Hiſtory, we cannot back this Authority with any other Teſtimony. But I am ſure, all thoſe that have a juſt eſteem for *Athenæus*, can have no ſlight one of this Argument againſt the credit of the Letters.

VI. The XIV Epiſtle gives *Xenophon* a long Narrative of *Socrates*'s Tryal and Death; being writ preſently after by one of his Scholars that was preſent at both. Among other particulars, he tells him, (z) *That the Oration or Charge againſt* Socrates *was drawn up by* Polycrates *the Sophiſt.* But I doubt this will turn to a Charge againſt another Sophiſt, for counterfeiting Letters. For, I think, I can plainly prove, That at the date of this Letter there was no ſuch report ever mention'd, that *Polycrates* had any hand in it; and, that this falſe Tradition, which afterwards obtained in the World, and gave occaſion to our Writer to ſay it in his Letter, did not begin till ſome years after *Socrates*'s condemnation.

(z) Ἦν ὁ λόγος Πολυκράτους τοῦ λογογράφου.

Diogenes Laertius brings *Hermippus*'s teſtimony, That *Polycrates* made the (a) Charge. Συνέγραψέ φησι τὸν λόγον Πολυκράτης ὁ σοφιστὴς, ὡς φησιν Ἕρμιππος. But, in oppoſition to this, he preſently ſubjoins; "That *Favorinus*, in the Firſt "Book

(a) *Vita Socrat.*

" Book of his *Commentaries*, ſays, That " *Polycrates*'s Oration againſt *Socrates* " is not *true and real:* becauſe he men- " tions in it the Walls, built by *Conon* " ſix years after *Socrates*'s death." To which *Laertius* ſubſcribes his own aſſent, Καὶ ἔ᾽ϛιν ὅ᾽τως ἔ᾽χον, *And ſo it is.* I may freely ſay, that this paſſage of *Favorinus* has not been yet rightly underſtood. It is generally interpreted, as if he denied the Oration that is attributed to *Polycrates* to be really his. But this is very far from being his opinion. For then he would be flatly confuted by *Iſocrates*, a Witneſs unanſwerable; who, in a Diſcourſe which he addreſſes to this very *Polycrates*, tells him; (*b*) *I perceive you value your ſelf moſt upon two Orations*, The Apology of Buſiris, *and* Accuſation of Socrates. But *Favorinus*'s meaning was; That *Polycrates* did not make that Oration for a true Charge to be ſpoke at the Tryal of *Socrates*; but writ it ſeveral years after, for no other Trial than that of his own Wit. The words in the *Greek* can admit of no other ſenſe; Μὴ ἔ᾽ναι ἀληθῆ τ᾽ λόγον τ᾽ Πολυκράτ᾽ς καὶ Σωκράτ᾽ς· ἐν αὐτῷ γὲ μνημονεύει τῶ τὸ Κόνωνα τειχῶν, &c. Obſerve, that he ſays μνημονεύει, *Polycrates mentions*: if he had denied him to be the Author, he would have ſaid in the Paſſive,

(*b*) Ἐπὶ τῇ Βυσίριδος ἀπολογίᾳ, καὶ τῇ Σωκράτους κατηγορίᾳ. *Iſoc. Buſir.*

There

There is mention'd. Beſides he expreſsly calls it τὸν λόγον τοῦ Πολυκράτους, only denies it to be ἀληθῆ. But if he had denied it to be His, he would have ſaid, Μὴ εἶναι Πολυκράτους τὸν λόγον τοῦτον τὸν καλὰ Σωκράτους: as *Laertius* ſpeaks in other places; (c) Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτείαν, ἣν φησιν ἔνιοι εἶναι Ξενοφῶντος ὁ Μάγνης Δημήτριος. (d) Διαλόγους, ὃς Πεισίστρατον ὁ Ἐφέσιος ἔλεγε μὴ εἶναι Αἰσχίνου. This, I think, is ſufficiently clear. Now we are to know, it was the cuſtom of the old Sophiſts to make an oſtentation of their Art, upon ſome difficult Subjects and Paradoxes, ſuch as other people could ſpeak nothing to: as the commendation of a Fever or the Gout. *Polycrates* therefore, to ſhew his Rhetoric in this way, writ an Apology of *Buſiris*, that kill'd and eat his Gueſts; (e) and of *Clytemneſtra*, that murder'd her Husband: and to give a proof of his skill, as well in accuſing Vertue, as in excuſing Vice, he writ an Indictment againſt *Socrates*; not ἀληθῆ, *the true one*, as *Favorinus* truly ſays, but only a Scholaſtic Exerciſe; ſuch as *Plato*, *Xenophon*, *Libanius* and others writ in his Defenſe. So that we are no more forced to believe, that His Oration was the true Charge that was ſpoken at *Socrates*'s Tryal; than, that he really pleaded for *Clytemneſtra*, when *Oreſtes* was going to kill

(c) In *Xenoph.*

(d) In *Æſchine.*

(e) *Quintil.* lib. ii. cap. 18.

kill her. Nay, it appears to me, from *Iſocrates* himſelf, that it was but a Scholaſtic Exerciſe, and after *Socrates*'s death. For he blames *Polycrates*, for reckoning *Alcibiades* among *Socrates*'s Diſciples: ſince, beſides that no body elſe ever counted him his Scholar; had he really been ſo, he had been a commendation to his Maſter; and not a diſparagement, which was the aim of the Sophiſt. (*f*) *So that* (ſays he) *if the dead could have knowledge of your Writings*, Socrates *would thank you.* Is not this a clear indication, that *Socrates* was *dead*, before the Oration was made? and that this was not the true Charge? For then he would have heard it at his Tryal: and there had been no occaſion to ſay, *if the dead could have knowledge of it.* In the cloſe of all, he adviſes him to leave off ſhewing his parts upon ſuch *villainous Themes*, πονηρὰς ὑποθέσεις; leſt he do public miſchief by putting falſe colours upon things. Here again we are plainly told, that his Action againſt *Socrates*, like thoſe for *Buſiris* and *Clytemneſtra*, was but a Declamation, a Theme and Exerciſe in the School, and not a real Indictment in the *Areopagus* at *Athens.* To all which let me add, That neither *Plato* nor *Xenophon* nor any body

(*f*) Εἰ γένοιτο ἐξουσία τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι βουλεύσασθαι περὶ τῶν εἰρημένων, ὁ μὲν χάριν ἂν εἰδείη σοι. *Iſoc. Buſir.*

contemporary with *Socrates*, ever once mention *Polycrates* for the Author of the Charge: which, had the thing been true, they would certainly have thrown in his teeth, conſidering the perpetual quarrel between Sophiſts and Philoſophers. And 'tis well known; that the *Athenians*, in a penitential mood, either baniſht or put to death all thoſe that had any hand in *Socrates*'s accuſation. If *Polycrates* then were ſo eminently guilty, as to draw up the Impeachment; how could he eſcape untoucht, when all the reſt ſuffer'd?

But when the *Accuſation of Socrates*, though only a Sophiſtical Exerciſe, came abroad in the world; it was natural enough, in ſome proceſs of time, that thoſe that heard of it only, or but perfunctorily read it, ſhould believe it to be the real *Charge*. We have ſeen already, that *Hermippus* was in that miſtake, who lived an hundred years after; and with him *Quintilian*, *Themiſtius*, and others innumerable. *Favorinus*, it ſeems, alone had the ſagacity, by a notice from Chronology, to find it of a more recent date than *Socrates*'s Tryal. And even that very paſſage of *Favorinus* has lain hitherto in the dark: ſo that my Reader may forgive me this prolixity and niceneſs; ſince he learns by it a piece of News. As for *Hermippus*, leſt

leſt the Authority of ſo celebrated an Author ſhould deterr one from ſo plain a truth; I will ſhew another ſlip of his, and a worſe than this, in the ſtory of *Socrates*. When *Gryllus* the Son of *Xenophon* was ſlain in the ſame battle that *Epaminondas* was; moſt of the Wits of that Age writ Elegies and Encomium's on him, in complement and conſolation to his Father. Among the reſt, * *Hermippus* ſays, *Socrates* was one. Which is a blunder of no leſs than XXXVII years, the interval between *Socrates*'s death and the battle of *Mantinea*.

* *Laert. in Xenoph.*

Socrates was put to death Olymp. XCV, 1. when *Laches* was Magiſtrate. This is univerſally (*g*) acknowledged; and to go about to prove it, were to add Light to the Sun. And ſix years after this, Olymp. XCVI, 3. (*h*) in *Eubulides*'s Magiſtracy, *Conon* repair'd the Walls. Which gave the hint to *Favorinus*, and after him to *Diogenes*, to diſcover the common miſtake about *Polycrates*'s Oration. But *Leo Allatius*, to avoid the force of their Argument, undertakes an impoſſible thing; to prolong *Socrates*'s life above twenty years beyond *Laches*: ſo that He might ſee *Conon*'s Walls, and *Polycrates*'s Declamation

(*g*) See *Diodorus*, *Favorinus*, *Diog. Laertius*, *Ariſtides*, *Marmor. Arund.* *Euſeb.* *Argumentum Iſocr.* *Buſir.* &c.

(*h*) *Diodor.* XIV. p. 303. *Favorin.* *Diog. Laert.*

mation be the true Charge at his Tryal. Which he would make out by comparing together ſome Scraps of different Authors, and ſome Synchroniſms of other Men's Lives with *Socrates*'s. As if thoſe things which are only miſtakes and unwary ſlips of the Writers, could have any force or credit againſt ſo many expreſs Authorities. By the ſame way that he proceeds, I will ſhew the quite contrary; that *Socrates* died twenty years before *Laches*'s Government. For we have it from good Hands, (*i*) That *Euripides*, in a Play of his call'd *Palamedes*, uſing theſe words, Ἐκφάνετ', ἐκφάνετε τὰν πάνσοφον, &c. deſigned to laſh the *Athenians* for *Socrates*'s murder: and the whole Theatre perceiving it, burſt into tears. *Socrates* therefore died before *Euripides*. But 'tis well known, that the latter died ſix years before *Laches* was Archon. Nay, *Socrates* muſt needs be dead, before *Palamedes* was acted. But that was acted Olymp. XCI, 1. (*k*), which is ſixteen years before *Laches*. Have I not proved now exactly the quite contrary to *Allatius*? But ſtill, I hope, I have more judgment, than to credit ſuch an oblique Argument againſt ſo many direct Teſtimonies. If *Allatius* had looked round about him, he would not have committed ſo great a blunder; while

(*i*) *Diog. Laert. in Socrat. Argum. Iſoc. Buſir.*

(*k*) *Ælian. Var. Hiſt.* ii, 1. *Schol. Ariſtoph.* Opvιθ. p. 401.

while he defends his Epiſtles at one Poſt, to expoſe them to worſe Aſſaults. If *Socrates* died in *Laches*'s Magiſtracy, one Epiſtle muſt be ſpurious, that mentions *Polycrates*. This Breach *Allatius* would ſecure; and therefore he will needs make him live ſeveral years longer. But then, ſay I, if we concede this to *Allatius*; not one Epiſtle only, but the whole bundle of them are ſpurious. For moſt of them plainly ſuppoſe, that *Socrates* died under *Laches*. Even this very Epiſtle complains (*l*) that *Xenophon* was abroad when *Socrates* ſuffer'd; and that the Expedition of *Cyrus* hindred him from being preſent then at *Athens*: and a ſecond Letter, xviii. to name no more, dated after *Socrates*'s death, makes *Xenophon* to have newly eſcaped the dangers of his long March through Enemies Countries. Now, all the world knows, (*m*) that *Cyrus*'s Expedition and *Xenophon*'s March was in *Laches*'s time, and the year before him. So that upon the whole; there is no eſcape, no evaſion from this Argument; but our Epiſtles muſt be convicted of a manifeſt Cheat.

(*l*) Ep. xiv.

(*m*) *Marm. Arund. Laert. Diodor.* &c.

VII. In the xvii Letter, one of *Socrates*'s Scholars, ſuppoſed to be preſent at *Athens* when the things he ſpeaks of were acted, ſays, the *Athenians* (*n*) put to death both *Anytus* and *Melitus*, the Proſecutors of

(*n*) Ἀνυτόν τε καὶ Μέλιτον ἀπέκτειναν.

(o) *Laert. in Socrat. & in Antiſth. Themiſt. Orat.* ii. *Auguſtin. de Civ. Dei*, viii, 3.

Socrates: which being contrary to known matter of fact, proves the Epiſtle to be a forgery. *Melitus*, indeed, was kill'd; but *Anytus* was only baniſht; and (*o*) ſeveral Writers ſpeak of him afterwards at *Heraclea* in *Pontus*.

VIII. The XVIII is a Letter of *Xenophon*'s, inviting ſome Friends to come to ſee him, at his Plantation near *Olympia*. He ſays, *Ariſtippus* and *Phædo* had made him a Viſit: and that he recited to them his

(p) Ἀπομνημονεύματα.
(q) Ἔδοκει ἁρμόδιά πνα εἶ).

(*p*) *Memoirs of Socrates*; which both of them (*q*) *approved* of. This alone is ſufficient to blaſt the reputation of our famous Epiſtles. For, how is it likely, that *Ariſtippus* would go ſo far to ſee *Xenophon*, who (*r*) was always his Enemy? Much leſs would he have given his approbation to a Book, that was a Satyr againſt himſelf. For the Book is yet in being; and in it he introduces *Socrates*, in a long Lecture, reprehending *Ariſtippus* (*s*) for his Intemperance and Luſt. Even *Laertius* takes notice, That he brought in *Ariſtippus*'s name upon that ſcandalous occaſion, out of the enmity he bare him.

(r) Ξενοφῶν ὃν εἶχε πρὸς αὐτὸν δυσμενῶς. *Laert. in Ariſtippo.*

(s) *Xenoph. Memorab.* lib. ii. *in princip.*

IX. We have already ſeen *Xenophon* writing *Socrates*'s Memoirs at *Scillus*, near *Olympia*. But in the XXII, to *Cebes* and *Simmias*, he is writing them at *Megara*; for there

the

the Letter is dated. And in the xxi, to *Xanthippe*, he invites her to come to him to *Megara*. One would think, there was more Sophiſts than one had a finger in this Volume of Letters: or if he was but one Author, Nature gave him a ſhort Memory without the bleſſing of a great Wit. 'Tis true, upon *Socrates*'s Execution, his Scholars left *Athens* for fear, (*t*) and retired to *Megara*, to the houſe of *Euclides*: which occaſion'd our Sophiſt to bring *Xenophon* thither too. But he ſhould have remembred, that while They were ſcared out of *Athens* for fear of their own Lives, He was ſafe at a great diſtance in the retinue of *Ageſilaus*; from whoſe company he went to *Scillus*, without ever reſiding at *Megara*. Nay, the Sophiſt is ſo indiſcreet, as to bring in *Xenophon* in *forma pauperis*, to beg and receive relief from *Cebes* and *Simmias*: whereas every body knows, that he got great riches in the War, (*u*) and lived in very great ſplendor and hoſpitality at *Scillus*.

(*t*) *Laert. in Euclid.*

(*u*) *Laert. in Xenoph. Xenoph. Exp. Cyri*, l. v. p. 350.

X. In the xxiv Epiſtle, *Plato* ſays, he is quite weary of a City Life; and had therefore retired into the Country, διατριβῶν ὑπὸ μακρὰν Ἐφεσιάδων, which *Allatius* tranſlates, *non longe ab Epheſtiadibus*. He ought to have ſaid, *ab Hephæſtiadis*. For the true word in the *Greek*, is Ἡφαιστιάδων.

Plato had ſome Eſtate there, which he diſpoſed of in his Will: τὸ ἐν Ἡφαιϛιαδῶν χωρίον, as 'tis in (w) *Laertius*. *Heſychius*; Ἡφαιϛιάδαι, Ἀθηναῖοι. *Stephanus Byz.* Ἡφαιϛιάδαι, δῆμος Ἀθηναίων· τὰ τοπικὰ, ἐξ Ἡφαιϛιαδῶν, &c. In the *Roman* Manuſcript of *Laertius*, 'tis writ ἐνιφιϛιάδων: which manner of ſpelling is found alſo in *Heſychius*, Ἰφίϛιος, ἥρως, ἀφ' οὗ Ἰφιϛιάδαι. If the Reader does believe, that our Letter-monger, like *Heſychius*, ſpelt the word wrong; he will be ſatisfied of the forgery: For ſurely, *Plato* himſelf knew the true name of his own Eſtate. But if he encline to abſolve the Author, and lay the blame upon the Copyers; he may pleaſe to accept of this, only as an Emendation.

(w) *Vita Platon.*

XI. The XXVII Epiſtle is *Ariſtippus*'s to his Daughter *Arete*: which, perhaps, is the very ſame that is mention'd by *Laertius*; who, among the Writings of this Philoſopher, names Ἐπιϛολὴ πρὸς Ἀρήτην τὴν θυγατέρα. *Allatius*, indeed, is ready to vouch it: but I am not ſo eaſie of belief. For here are (x) two other Letters of his in this Parcel, and both of them writ in the *Doric* Dialect, though directed to *Athens*: becauſe, forſooth, he was a *Cyrenæan*, and the *Doric* his native Tongue. Pray, what was the matter then, that in this he uſes the *Attic*; though he writ from

(x) IX. & XI.

Sicily

Sicily a *Dorian* Country, to his own Daughter at *Cyrene*? One would ſuſpect, as I obſerved before, that a couple of Sophiſts clubb'd to this Collection. 'Tis true, we know, from *Laertius*; that of XXV *Dialogues* publiſht by *Ariſtippus*, ſome were in the *Doric* Idiom, and ſome in the *Attic*. But that, I ſuppoſe, was done becauſe of the variety of his Perſons. In ſome Dialogues the Speakers were *Sicilians*, and thoſe were writ in the *Doric*; and where the *Athenians* were introduced, the *Attic* was proper. But now, in this Letter to his Daughter, both Parties are *Dorians*; and ſo this Epiſtle ſhould rather be *Doric*, than either of the other two.

XII. In the ſame Letter he mentions her Eſtate in *Bernice*, τὸ ἐν Βερνίκῃ κλῆμα. There is no queſtion but he means Βερενίκη; perhaps that City not far from *Cyrene*. But there was nothing then in all *Afric* called by that name: for Βερενίκη is the *Macedonian* idiom for Φερενίκη, *the Victorious*. In that Countrey, φ was generally changed into β: as (*y*) inſtead of κεφαλὴ they ſaid κεβλὴ; for φίλιππος, βίλιππος; for φαλακρὸς, βαλακρὸς; and ſo in others. So that Βερενίκη was unknown in *Afric*, till the *Macedonians* came thither: and indeed, they had their names from the Wives of the *Ptolemees*, a whole

(*y*) *Etym. Magn.* &c.

whole century of years after the date of this Letter.

XIII. He goes on, and tells his Daughter, *That if he ſhould die, he would have her go to* Athens, *and live with* Myrto *and* Xanthippe *the two Wives of* Socrates. It was a common Tradition among the Writers of Philoſophic Hiſtory, that *Socrates* had theſe two Wives at once; and from thence our Sophiſt made them the complement of a place in this Epiſtle. (z) There are cited as Authors of this ſtory, *Calliſthenes*, *Demetrius Phalereus*, *Satyrus*, and *Ariſtoxenus*, who all took it from *Ariſtotle* in his Book *Of Nobility*, περὶ Εὐγενείας. But Polygamy being againſt the Law of that Commonwealth, and the ſtory therefore improbable; *Hieronymus Rhodius* produces a temporary Statute made in *Socrates*'s days, That by reaſon of the ſcarcity of People, a Man might marry two Wives at a time. But notwithſtanding ſuch a fluſh of Authorities, (a) *Panætius* the Stoic, a very great Man, writ expreſly againſt all thoſe named above; and, in the opinion of *Plutarch*, (b) *ſufficiently* confuted the Tradition of the Two Wives. For my own part, I dare pin my belief upon two ſuch excellent Judgments, as *Plutarch*'s and *Panætius*'s; and upon their credit alone, pronounce this Letter to be an Impoſture

(z) *Laert. in Socrat. Plutarch. Ariſtid. Athen.* xiii. P. 556.

(a) *Athenæus, Plutarch.* ib.

(b) ἱκανῶς.

poſture. What grounds they proceeded on I cannot now tell; but I think there is apparent reaſon for rejecting the ſtory, even laying aſide their teſtimony. For none of *Socrates*'s acquaintance, not *Plato*, not *Xenophon*, ſay one word of this *Myrto*. *Ariſtotle*, we ſee, was the firſt that mention'd her: but (*c*) *Plutarch* ſuſpects that Book to be ſpurious. So that all this Tradition roſe at firſt from a Falſary, that counterfeited *Ariſtotle*'s name. Beſides, they do not agree in telling their tale; one ſays, that he had both Wives together: another, that *Myrto* was his firſt Wife, and the ſecond came after her death: another, that *Xanthippe* was the firſt. Let either of them come firſt, and our Epiſtles are falſe; for here we have Both ſurviving him, and living together. (*d*) One ſays, this *Myrto* was *Ariſtides*'s Daughter; another his Grand-daughter; and another, his Grandſon's Daughter. Whatſoever ſhe was; if ſhe outliv'd her Husband, according to the Letters, pray where was her Ladyſhip at the time of his ſuffering? (*e*) *Xanthippe*, like a loving Wife, attended him in the Priſon; but the other ne'er came near him. 'Tis a miſtake, ſure, that has paſt upon the world, that *Xanthippe* was the Scold: it ſhould ſeem, that *Myrto* had the better

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) *Plato Apolog.*

title

title to that honourable name. But what ſhall we ſay to *Hieronymus*, who brings you the very Statute, that gave allowance of two Wives at once? *Panætius*, you ſee, believed it not: and why may not a Statute be forged, as eaſily as theſe Epiſtles? If there was ſuch an Act, there appears no great wiſdom in it. It is certain, there is near an equality in the births of Males and Females. So that if ſome Men had two Wives for their ſhare, others muſt go without: and what remedy would that be againſt the ſcarcity of People? Beſides that by ſuch a Law the Rich only would be accommodated, who were able to maintain a couple: the poorer ſort, who are always the moſt fruitful, would be in worſe circumſtances than before. And without doubt, a very ſtrong intereſt would have been made againſt the paſſing of ſuch a Bill; (*f*) as we know what the *Roman* Matrons did, when *Papirius Prætextatus* made a like ſtory to his Mother. 'Tis very odd too, that no body but *Hieronymus* ſhould ever hear of this Statute; and He too a ſuſpected Witneſs, becauſe he brings it to ſerve a turn, and to help at a hard pinch. But certainly ſuch a Political Occurrence, had it been true, could never have lain hid from the whole tribe of Hiſtorians. It had

(*f*) *A. Gellius*, li. 1. c. 23.

had very well deſerved not only a mention, but a remark. But how could it poſſibly eſcape the fancy and ſpleen of all the Comœdians of that Age? how could they miſs ſo pleaſant an argument of jeſt and ridicule? Thoſe that are acquainted with the condition of thoſe times, will look upon this as next to a Demonſtration. But let us grant, if you will, half a dozen Wives to *Socrates*; yet nevertheleſs our Epiſtles will be ſtill in the mire. For here our Sophiſt makes the two Women live amicably together: which is pretty hard to believe: for (as (*g*) thoſe that make them Two, tell the ſtory of them) while their Husband was alive, they were perpetually fighting. But, which is worſe yet, there are other Letters in the bundle, that plainly ſuppoſe *Socrates* to have had but one Wife. (*h*) He himſelf, writing to ſome body, tells him this domeſtic news, *That* Xanthippe *and the Children are well:* but ſays not a word of my Lady *Myrto*. (*i*) *Xenophon* ſends a Letter top full of kindneſs and commendation to *Xanthippe* and the Little ones; but it was very uncivil in him, to take no notice of the other; ſince, according to the ſtory, ſhe brought her Husband the more Children. Nay, if we allow this Letter of *Xenophon*'s to be genuine, he play'd a falſe and dirty

(*g*) *Ariſtoxenus apud Theodoret*, Serm. xii. ad *Græcos*.

(*h*) Ep. iv.

(*i*) Ep. xxi.

dirty trick, much againſt his character. For at the date of this Epiſtle, if we believe the very next (*k*) to it, he was writing *Socrates*'s *Memoirs*. So that while he here in his Letter wheedles the poor Woman, and makes her little Preſents, and commends her for her love to her Husband, and for many good qualities; in his Book (*l*) he traduces her to that preſent Age, and to all Poſterity, for the moſt curſt and deviliſh Shrew, *that ever was or ever would be.* Nay, which makes it the baſer, he was the only Man that ſaid this of her; for neither *Plato* nor any of the old *Socratics* writ a word about her Scolding. Which made (*m*) *Athenæus* ſuſpect it was a Calumny: eſpecially ſince *Ariſtophanes* and his Brethren of the Stage, in all their Raillery and Satyr upon *Socrates*, never once twitted him about his Wife. Well, let that be as it will: but what ſhall we ſay to *Xenophon*'s double dealing? For my part, rather than I'll harbour ſuch a thought of that great Man, I'll quit a whole Cart-load of ſuch Letters as theſe.

(*k*) Ep. xxii.

(*l*) *Xenoph. Conviv.* p. 876.

(*m*) Lib. v. p. 219.

XIV. *Xenophon*, in the xv Letter, tells this ſtory of *Plato*, to whom he bore a grudge; That he ſhould ſay, *None of his Writings were to be aſcribed to himſelf, but to* Socrates *young and handſom*; Φησὶ μηδὲν εἶναι ποίημα αὐτοῦ

αὐτῷ, Σωκράτης μέντοι νέος ἢ, καλῷ ὄντι. Now, this ſentence is taken out of *Plato*'s Second Epiſtle to *Dionyſius* the Younger : Οὐδ' ἔστι σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος ἐδὲν, ἐδ' ἔσαι· τὰ δ' νὺν λεγόμενα Σωκράτης ὅτι, καλῷ ἢ νέος γεγονότος. Here's a blunder with a witneſs, from the Sophiſt's ignorance in Chronology. For his forged Letter of *Xenophon* bears date immediately after *Socrates*'s death : but the true one of *Plato*, which *Xenophon* here alludes to, is recenter by a vaſt while. For *Dionyſius* came but to the Crown Olymp. CIII, 1. which is XXXII years after the Tryal of *Socrates*.

I muſt obſerve one thing more, that by no means ſhould be omitted. There were formerly more Epiſtles of *Xenophon* extant, than appear in this Collection. A large fragment is cited in (*o*) *Stobæus*, out of his Letter to *Crito* ; (*p*) two fragments out of a Letter to *Sotira* ; (*q*) and two more out of one to *Lamprocles* : none of which are found here in *Allatius*'s Parcel. *Theodoret* produces a paſſage out of a Letter of his to *Æſchines* ; wherein he jerks *Plato* (*r*) *for his Ambition and Voluptuouſneſs* ; *to gratifie which, he went to* Sicily, *to* Dionyſius's *Court*. (*s*) *Euſebius* has this paſſage and more out of the ſame Epiſtle : and the whole is extant in (*t*) *Stobæus*. What ſhall

(*o*) Serm. 81.
(*p*) Serm. 120, 123.
(*q*) Serm. 5.
(*r*) Ἔρως πυρὰ νύκτα, ἢ ἀντὶ λιτῆς διαίτης Σικελιώτης γαστρὸς ἀμέτρου λεχάνη. (*s*) *Præp. Evang.* XIV. 12.
(*t*) Serm. 78.

ſhall we ſay? that the true Letters of *Xenophon* were extant in thoſe days? or that thoſe too were a Cheat, and belong'd to the ſame Volume whence theſe of *Allatius* were taken? And ſo, as I obſerv'd before, they will be older than *Libanius*'s time. I am afraid it will be thought ill manners to queſtion the judgment of *Euſebius* and *Theodoret*. But we know, (*u*) they have made other miſtakes of a like nature: and the very Letter which they cite, betrays it ſelf to be a counterfeit. *Xenophon*, we ſee, reproaches *Plato*, in a Letter to *Æſchines*. If this were true, it was a moſt rude affront to the Perſon he writ to, whoſe friendſhip he courts ſo much in the reſt of his Letter. For *Æſchines* himſelf was guilty of the very ſame fault, and is wounded through *Plato*'s ſide. 'Tis well known, that He too, as well as *Plato* and *Ariſtippus* and others, made a Voyage to *Sicily*, and ſtruck in with *Dionyſius*; (*w*) and that purely for Money and the Table. (*x*) *Lucian* ſays, He was Paraſite to the Tyrant; and (*y*) another tells us, he liked his Entertainment ſo well, that he did not ſtir from him, till he was depoſed. I would ask any Man now, if he can ſtill believe it a genuine Letter; let him have what veneration he can for the Learning of *Euſebius*.

(*u*) See *Diſſert. upon Jo. Malal.*

(*w*) *Laert. & Suidas in Æſch. Plut. de Adulat.*

(*x*) *In Paraſito.*

(*y*) *Polycritus apud Laert.*

In

In the beginning of this Diſcourſe, I have ſaid, *That I heard of none, that, ſince the firſt publication of theſe Letters, called them into queſtion.* But I was ſhewn to day (after mine was in the Preſs) in Biſhop *Pearſon's Vindiciæ Epp. Sancti Ignatii*, a (z) Digreſſion made on purpoſe againſt *Socrates's Epiſtles*. I muſt confeſs, with ſome ſhame, I had either never read that Chapter, or utterly forgot it. But I am glad now to find that imcomparable Man both to think it worth going out of his way to diſcover this Impoſture, and to confirm me in my judgment by the acceſſion of his great Authority. There is nothing there diſagreeing with what I had ſaid; but that his Lordſhip allows the Epiſtle to *Æſchines*, cited by *Euſebius*, to be genuine: which I had endeavoured to convict of a forgery. I referr it to thoſe that pleaſe to read both; whether they think I have juſt reaſon to change my opinion: eſpecially when I ſhall tell them, That not *Æſchines* only, but even *Xenophon* himſelf made a Viſit to *Dionyſius*. I have * *Athenæus* for my Authority, a Witneſs beyond all exception. *Ξενοφῶν γὲν ὁ Γρύλλε παρὰ Διονυσίῳ*, &c. Xenophon (ſays he) *the Son of* Gryllus, *when at* Dionyſius *the* Sicilian's *Table the Cup-bearer forced the company to drink*;

(z) Par. II. p. 12, 13.

* Lib. x. P. 427.

Pray, ſays he, Dionyſius (ſpeaking aloud to the Tyrant,) *if your Butler forces Wine upon us againſt our wills, why may not your Cook as well compell us to eat?* So that if we ſuppoſe the Letter genuine, the abſurdity will double it ſelf; both Parties being guilty of the very ſame thing, that is charged upon *Plato*.

OF

EURIPIDES's EPISTLES.

'TIS a bold and dangerous venture, to attack *Euripides*'s *Letters*; ſince a very Learned *Greek* Profeſſor has ſo paſſionately eſpouſed them; that he declares it to be (a) *great Impudence and want of all Judgment* to queſtion the Truth of them. I do not care to meddle with Controverſie upon ſuch high Wagers as thoſe: but if I may have leave to give my opinion, without ſtaking ſuch valuable things as Modeſty and good Senſe upon it, I am very ready to ſpeak my mind candidly and freely.

(a) *Perfrictæ frontis & judicii imminuti.* Eurip. Edit. Cantab. par. ii. p. 525.

I. There are only five Epiſtles now extant, aſcribed to *Euripides*: but without doubt there were formerly more of them;

them; as we have ſeen juſt before, that we have not now the whole Sett of *Xenophon's* Letters. Neither can we ſuppoſe a Sophiſt of ſo barren an Invention, as to have his Fancy quite crampt and jaded with poor Five. We have here a peculiar happineſs, which we wanted in the reſt; to know whom we are obliged to for the great bleſſing of theſe Epiſtles. *Apollonides*, that writ a Treatiſe Περὶ κατεψευσμένης Ἱστορίας, 'About *falſified Hiſtory*, ſays, one (*b*) *Sa-* 'birius *Pollo* forged them, the ſame Man 'that counterfeited the Letters of *Aratus*.' This we are told by the Writer of *Aratus*'s Life, no unlearned Author: who does not contradict him about theſe of *Euripides*; but for *Aratus*'s, he ſays, that, bating this *Apollonides*, every body elſe believed them to be genuine. I cannot paſs any judgment of what I never ſaw; for *Aratus*'s Letters are not now to be had: but if they were no better than theſe of our Tragedian, I ſhould, in ſpite of the common vogue, be of *Apollonides*'s mind; and I wiſh that Book of his were now extant. One may know, by the manner of the Name, that this *Sabirius Pollo* was a *Roman*: but I do not find ſuch a Family as the *Sabirii*, nor ſuch a Sirname as *Pollo*. What if we read *Sabinius*, or *Sabidius Pollio*?

(*b*) Σαβίριος Πόλλων.

Non amo te, Sabidi; nec poſſum dicere quare.

If that *Sabidius* in *Martial* was the forger of our Epiſtles; though the Poet could give none, yet I can give a very good reaſon, why I do not love him.

But the Learned Advocate for the Letters makes ſeveral Exceptions againſt the Teſtimony of *Apollonides*. As firſt, *That we may fairly inferr from it, that a great many others believed them to be true.* Alas! How many more, both Ancients and Moderns, believed *Phalaris*'s to be true? If that argument would have done the work, I might have ſpared this Diſſertation. *But prove, that theſe Letters now extant are the ſame that were forged by* Sabirius. Commend to me an Argument, that, like a Flail, there's no fence againſt it. Why, had we been told too, that he made *Phalaris*'s *Epiſtles*: yet how could we *prove*, unleſs ſome paſſages were cited out of them, that they were the ſame that we have now? But though I cannot demonſtrate that theſe are *Sabirius*'s; yet I'll demonſtrate them by and by to be an Impoſture; and I hope then it will be no injuſtice to lay them at his door. *But 'tis an evidence, that the true* Epiſtles of Euripides *were once extant; becauſe ſome body thought it not improper to father falſe ones upon him.* Now, I ſhould think the very contrary; that

the

the Cuckow does not lay her Egg, where the Neſt is already full. At leaſt, I am reſolved I'll never go a book-hunting after the genuine Epiſtles of *Phalaris*; though ſome body has cheated the World with a parcel of falſe ones.

II. It might eaſily have happen'd, tho' we ſuppoſe the Letters ſpurious, that in ſo ſmall a number as Five, there could be nothing found to convict them by. But ſo well has the Writer managed his Buſineſs; that every one of them has matter enough to their own Detection. The laſt and principal of them is dated from *Macedonia*, in anſwer to ſome reproaches, that were caſt upon him at *Athens* for his going to *Archelaus*. *As for what you write from* Athens; ſays he, *pray know, that I value no more,* ὧν νῦν Ἀγάθων ἢ Μέσατος λέγει, *what* Agatho *or* Meſatus *now ſay; than I formerly did, what* Ariſtophanes *babbled.* Here we have the Poet *Agatho*, (for without doubt he means the Poet, ſince he has join'd him with *Ariſtophanes*) reſiding at *Athens*, and blaming *Euripides* for living with *Archelaus*. Now, could any thing be more unfortunate for our *Sabirius Pollo*, than the naming of this Man? For even this *Agatho* himſelf was then with *Archelaus* in (c) *Euripides*'s company: beſides that they were always

(c) *Ælian.* II, 21. & XIII, 4. *Plut. in Apoph. Schol. Ariſtoph.* Βατ. χ.

good friends and acquaintance, not there only, but before at *Athens*.

But perhaps ſome may ſuſpect, it was another *Agatho* a (*d*) Comic Poet, that was meant in the Letter, and not the famous *Agatho* the Tragedian. This I find to be the Opinion of the Learned Perſon above-named. But I will make bold to expunge this Comic *Agatho* out of the Catalogue of Mankind. For he ſprung but up, like a Muſhroom, out of a rotten paſſage in *Suidas*; who, after he has ſpoken of *Agatho* the Tragic Poet, has theſe words; ἠθομῳδοποιὸς Σωκράτης διδασκάλε· ἠθομῳδεῖτο ᾗ εἰς ἁλύτητα: which his Interpreters (*Wolfius* and *Portus*) thus tranſlate, *Fuit & alius Agatho Comœdiarum Scriptor.* But there's nothing like *Fuit & alius* in the Original; but the ſame *Agatho* is here meant, that was mentioned before. This they might have known from the following words, ἠθομῳδεῖτο ᾗ εἰς ἁλύτητα, *he was libelled for his Effeminateneſs.* For whom can that belong to, but to *Agatho* the Tragœdian; whom (*e*) *Lucian* ranks with *Cinyras* and *Sardanapalus*? Do but read *Ariſtophanes*'s *Theſmophoriazuſæ*; and you'll ſee him ridiculed upon that ſcore for ſome pages together. The Scholiaſt upon Βάτεραχοι of

(*d*) *Vita Eurip. p.* 29. Ed. Cant.

(*e*) Πάναβρόν τινα Σαρδανάπαλον, ἢ Κινύραν, ἢ αὐτὸν Ἀγάθωνα ἢ τ τραγῳδίας ἐπέρασον ποιητὴν. *Rhet. Præc.*

of the ſame Poet ; Ἀγάθων (ſays he) ἔτος τραγικὸς ποιητὴς ὢν μαλακίᾳ διεβάλλετο. Here you ſee, it is expreſsly ſaid, (*f*) Agatho *the Tragœdian was traduced as Effeminate.* It follows preſently in the ſame Scholiaſt ; Οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ἀγάθων κωμῳδοποιὸς τοῦ Σωκράτους διδασκάλου ; where we have the very words of *Suidas* applied to the Tragœdian : ἔτος, *this ſame* Agatho *was a Comœdian,* Socrates *being his Maſter :* not *another,* as the Tranſlators of *Suidas* interpolate the Text. But is it true then, that our ſpruce *Agatho* writ Comedies too ? Nothing like it ; though the learned (*g*) *Gregorius Gyraldus* affirms it from this very paſſage. 'Tis a mere oſcitation of our Scholiaſt, and of *Suidas* that gaped after him : the occaſion and ground of the ſtory being nothing but this. *Plato's Convivium* was in the Houſe of this *Agatho :* in the (*h*) concluſion of which, *Socrates* is introduced proving to *Agatho* and *Ariſtophanes ; That it belonged to the ſame Man, and required the ſame Parts, to write both Comedy and Tragedy ; and that he that was a skilful Tragœdian, was alſo a Comœdian.* Hence have our wiſe Grammarians dreſs'd up a fine ſtory, That *Agatho* was a Comœdian, and of *Socrates's* teaching. And now, I hope, I have evidently proved the thing that I propoſed ;

(*f*) P. 133.

(*g*) *Dialog. de Poet.*

(*h*) P. 336. Τὸν τέχνῃ τραγῳδοποιὸν ὄντα καὶ κωμῳδοποιὸν εἶναι.

to the utter diſgrace of our admired Epiſtles.

III. *Euripides*, we have ſeen, did not value one farthing, *what either* Agatho *or* (*i*) Meſatus *ſaid of him.* I would gladly be better acquainted with this ſame *Meſatus*; for I never once met with him but here in this Letter. He muſt be a Brother of the Stage too, by the company he is placed in: But what was the matter? Was he ſo hiſs'd and exploded, that he durſt never ſhew his head ſince? I have a fancy, he was of the ſame family with (*k*) *Phalaris*'s two Fairy Tragœdians, *Ariſtolochus* and *Lyſimus*: and that theſe Letters too are a kin to thoſe of the Tyrant. But, perhaps, you'll ſay, this *Meſatus* is but a fault in the Copies. It may be ſo: and I could help you to another Tragœdian of thoſe times, not altogether unlike him; one *Melitus*, the ſame that afterwards accuſed *Socrates*; who was likely enough to hate *Euripides*, that was the Philoſopher's friend. Or I could invent ſome other medicine for the place: but let thoſe look to that, that believe the Epiſtles true, or think them worth the curing.

(*i*) ἢ Μέσατος.

(*k*) Epiſt. lxiii, & xcvii.

The very Learned Defender of the Epiſtles, one of a ſingular Induſtry and a moſt diffuſe Reading, has propoſed ſome

ſome Objections againſt the Letters, communicated to him by a private Hand. That private Perſon, at the requeſt of the Editor, imparted his opinion to him in a very ſhort Letter: to which he had no Anſwer returned; till he found it, with ſome ſurprize, brought upon the ſtage in (*l*) print; and his Reaſons routed and triumph'd. But let us ſee if we can rally them again: perhaps they may keep their ground in a ſecond Engagement.

(*l*) *Eurip.* Edit. Cant. p. 27, & 523.

IV. Our friend *Sabirius Pollo*, to make the whole Work throughout worthy of himſelf, has directed this ſame Letter to *Cephiſophon*, who was *Euripides*'s Actor for his Plays. For he had often heard of *Cephiſophon*; and ſo he would not let him paſs without a ſhare in his Epiſtles. But he ſhould have minded Time and Hiſtory a little better, if he hoped to put himſelf upon Us for the Author he mimic's. 'Tis true, *Cephiſophon* and our Poet were once mighty dear acquaintance: but there fell out a foul accident, that broke off the friendſhip. For *Euripides* caught him Acting for him, not upon the Stage, but in private with his Wife. Which buſineſs taking wind abroad, and making a perpetual Jeſt, was one of the main reaſons why he left *Athens* and went to *Macedonia*. And is it likely, after all this, that our

Poet

Poet ſhould write a Letter to him, as ſoon as he got thither? that he ſhould uſe him as his moſt intimate Friend, nearer to him than his own Children? I know, there are ſome ſo fond of our Epiſtles, that *they value all this as nothing*. *Cephiſophon* is ſo much in their Books; that whatſoever is ſaid againſt him, muſt be calumny and detraction. Give me an Advocate, that will ſtick cloſe and hang upon a Cauſe. By being their Editor, he is retain'd for the Letters; and therefore he muſt not deſert his Client. But why ſhall no Teſtimony be allowed, that touches *Cephiſophon*? Are not (*m*) *Ariſtophanes* and his Commentator, and *Suidas* and (*n*) *Thomas Magiſter* all lawful and good Evidence? And is there one ſingle Witneſs againſt them in his behalf? Not a Writer is now extant, that mentions his name, but what tells the ſtory of him: and if we muſt not believe them; we ſhall want new Evidence to prove, there ever was ſuch a Man.

(*m*) P. 167, 184.

(*n*) In *Vita Eurip.*

V. In a Diſquiſition of this nature, an inconſiſtency in Time and Place is an argument that reaches every body. All will cry out, that *Phalaris*, *&c.* are ſpurious, when they ſee ſuch breaches upon Chronology. But I muſt profeſs, I ſhould as fully have believed them ſo; though

though the Writers had eſcaped all miſtakes of that kind. For as they were commonly men of ſmall endowments, that affected to make theſe Forgeries; a great Man diſdaining ſo baſe and ignoble a work: ſo they did their buſineſs accordingly; and expreſſed rather themſelves, than thoſe they acted. For they knew not how to obſerve Decorum, in a Quality ſo different from their own: like the ſilly Player, that would repreſent *Hercules*; tall indeed, but ſlender, without bulk and ſubſtance. Let us ſee the conduct of this Author: In the firſt Letter, *Archelaus* ſends *Euripides* ſome Money; and our Poet, as if his Profeſſion were like a Monaſtic Vow of Poverty, *utterly refuſes it*. And why, forſooth, does he refuſe it? Why, *it was too great a Summ for his condition.* Yes, to be ſure; when a Sophiſt makes a Preſent, the greateſt Summ coſts no more than the leaſt. *But it was difficult to be kept, and the fingers of Thieves would itch at it.* Alas for him; with the expence of one Bag, out of many, he might have provided a Strong Box, and new Doors and Locks to his Houſe. But why could he not accept a Little of it? Even (*o*) *Socrates* himſelf and *Xenocrates* took a modicum out of Preſents, and return'd the reſt again. And is a Poet more ſelf-denying,

(*o*) *Laertius, in Socrat & Xenoc.*

denying, than the moſt mortified of the Philoſophers? But the beſt of all, is, *That* Clito *the King's chief Miniſter threatned to be angry with him, if he refuſed it.* What, could *Clito* expect before-hand, that the Preſent would be refuſed? The moſt ſagacious States-man, ſure, that ever Monarch was bleſt with. *Alexander* could not fore-ſee ſuch a thing; but was mightily ſurprized, when *Xenocrates* would not receive ſome Money that he ſent him:

(p) *Plut. Apoph.*

" (*p*) What, ſays he, has *Xenocrates* no " Friends to give it to, if he need it not " himſelf?" As for our Poet, he had Friends, I aſſure you; but all of his own kidney, *men of Contentment, that would not finger a penny of it,* τὸ αὐταρκὲς ἡμῖν τε κὴ τοῖς φίλοις παρὸν. What would one give to purchaſe a Sett of ſuch acquaintance? And yet, I know not how, in the Fifth Letter, their appetites were come to 'em; For in that, *Euripides* himſelf, from *Archelaus*'s Court, ſhared ſome Preſents among them; and we hear not one word, but that all was well taken.

VI. The reſt of this Letter is employed in begging pardon (*q*) *for the two Sons of a* Pellæan *old fellow*, who had done ſomething to deſerve Impriſonment. And the Third and Fourth are Common Places of Thanks for granting this requeſt. Now, beſides

(q) Πελλαῖος γήρων.

that

that the whole Buſineſs has the Air and Viſage of Sophiſtry; for this ſame is a mighty Topic too in *Phalaris's* Epiſtles: 'tis a plain violation of good Senſe, to petition for a Man without telling his Name: as if *Pella* the royal City had no Old Man in it but one. How can ſuch an Addreſs be real? But to this they give a double Anſwer; *That a Sophiſt, if this was one, could not be at a loſs for a Name: he might eaſily have put one here; as hereafter he names* Amphias, Lapretes *and others.* But the point is not, what he *might* have done, but what he *has* done. He *might* have named ſome other Poet at *Athens*, and not *Agatho* that was then in *Macedonia.* All thoſe miſtakes and blunders of *Phalaris* and the reſt *might* eaſily have been avoided, had the Writers had more Hiſtory and Diſcretion. (r) *But he had writ a Letter before this about the ſame buſineſs; and there we muſt ſuppoſe he had mention'd his name.* This indeed would be ſomething, if it would carry water. But though the Sophiſt has told you ſo; do not raſhly believe him. For it is plain, that pretended Letter muſt have been ſent to *Archelaus*, before this vaſt Preſent came from him. Why then did not the ſame Meſſenger that brought the Money, bring the

(r) Πρότερον ἐπιστέλλαμέν σοι.

the Grant too of his Petition? Would the King, that did him this mighty Honour and Kindneſs, deny him at the ſame time that ſmall and juſt Requeſt? For the crime of thoſe Priſoners was ſurely no hainous buſineſs. Had it been a deſign to aſſaſſinate the King, he would never have interceded for them. The Charge againſt them was a venial fault: or were it the blackeſt accuſation, their Innocence at leaſt would clear them: for our Poet himſelf tells us, (*s*) *They had done no body any wrong.*

(*s*) Οὐδὲν ἀδικεῖν ἐοίκασιν.

VII. The Second Epiſtle is to *Sophocles*, whom he makes to be ſhipwrack'd at the Iſland *Chios*; the Veſſel and Goods being loſt, but all the Men ſaved. That *Sophocles* was at *Chios*, we are informed by (*t*) *Ion Chius* the Tragœdian; who relates a long converſation of his there. If our Author here means the ſame Voyage, as probably he does; he is convicted of a cheat. For (*t*) then *Sophocles* was Commander of a Fleet with *Pericles* in the *Samian* War; and went to *Chios*, and thence to *Lesbos*, for auxiliary Forces. But our Mock-*Euripides* never thinks of his publick Employment; but adviſes him to return home at his leiſure; as if it had been a Voyage for Diverſion. *Yes*, ſays his Advocate; *but why might he not be at* Chios *another*

(*t*) *Athen.* XIII, 603.

(*u*) Ibid. & *Thucyd.* I, 75.

another time, though no body ſpeak of it, about private Affairs? Yes; why not, indeed? For *Sophocles* was ſo (*w*) courteous and good-natur'd a Man, that, to do our Letter-monger a kindneſs, he would have gone to every Iſland in the *Archipelago.* But 'tis hard though, that a good Ship muſt be loſt, and our Poet ſwim for't, to oblige the little Sophiſt. For I fear the Veſſel was caſt away, purely to bring in (*x*) *the great loſs of* Sophocles's *Plays.* Alas! alas! Could he not go over the water, but he muſt needs take his Plays with him? And muſt *Euripides*, of all men, lament the loſs of them; whoſe own Plays muſt, probably, have truckled to them at the next Feaſt of *Bacchus?* Muſt *Euripides*, his Rival, his Antagoniſt, tell him, (*y*) *That his Orders about family affairs were executed:* as if He had been employ'd by him, as Steward of his Houſhold?

(*w*) *Ion Chius*, ib. *Ariſtoph. Ranis.*

(*x*) Ἡ περὶ τὰ δράματα συμφορά.

(*y*) Τὰ οἰκοι ἰδίᾳ χρήματα.

V.l. The Fifth Letter is a long Apology for his going to *Macedonia.* "Can they "think, ſays he, that I came hither for "love of Money? I ſhould have come then, "when I was younger; and not now, "to lay (*z*) my bones in a barbarous "Countrey, and make *Archelaus* richer "by my Death." I obſerved it, as no ſmall mark of a Sophiſt, That our Author fore-

(*z*) Ἵνα ἐν βαρβάρῳ γῇ ἀποθάνωμεν.

foretells, he was to die in *Macedonia*; where, we know, he was worried to death by a pack of Dogs. *But what wonder*, ſay they, *if an Old Man of Seventy predict his own death?* I do not queſtion, but our Poet might preſage himſelf to be Mortal. But 'twas an odd gueſs to hit upon the time and place, when and where he was to die. For, what ground was there to be ſo poſitive? The Letter, we ſee, carries date juſt after his arrival at Court? He had, as yet, had very ſhort trial, whether all things would continue to his liking. And we have no reaſon to ſuppoſe, that he came thither for good and all; never to ſee *Athens* again. Might he not, by ſome accident, or ſupplanted by ſome rival, loſe the King's favour? Or, was he ſure His life would laſt as long as his own? 'Twas a violent death, and not mere Age and Crazineſs, that took our Poet away at laſt: and he knew *Sophocles* to be then alive and hearty and making of Plays ſtill; that was Fourteen years older than himſelf. In theſe circumſtances to be ſo poſitive about his dying there, was a Prophecy as bold as any of the *Pythian* Oracle. *But*, ſay they, *he gives a hint too, that* Archelaus *might be depoſed: which a Sophiſt would not ſay, becauſe it never came to paſs.* That was true

and

and came to paſs every day, that he *might* be depoſed: and he does not ſuggeſt, that it actually would be ſo; for he expreſly ſays, (*a*) *God would always ſtand by the King, and ſupport him.* But indeed, as they interpret a paſſage there; it looks as if he had foreboded real Miſchief; Οὐδὲ ἀνιάσῃ, ὅτι οἰχέλᾳ ὁ καιρὸς εἰς ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν, ἀνεθεὶς φρῶδ' ἦδη. Which laſt words they tranſlate, *ubi jam deſtitutus fueris & abdicatus,* "when you are de-"ſerted and depoſed." But with all due ſubmiſſion, I will aſſume the freedom of changing the verſion. For ἀνεθεὶς and φρῶδ' belong to the word καιρὸς, and not to *Archelaus*: and the diſtinction is to be put thus; ὅτι οἰχέλᾳ ὁ καιρὸς, εἰς ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν ἀνεθεὶς, φρῶδ' ἦδη; *Tempus ad exercendam benignitatem conceſſum*; "You will not grieve, that the "time is gone paſt recalling, which was "granted you by God to do good to "Mankind in." This, I ſuppoſe, is now clear enough; and *Archelaus* is in no danger of being depoſed by this ſentence. But let us examine our Author's next words; (*b*) *To make Archelaus richer by my death.* A very good Thought indeed, and worthy of *Euripides.* But pray what could the King get by his death? Would the Poet be compell'd to make him his

(*a*) Παρέσαι μὲν ἀεὶ ὁ θεὸς, καὶ σήσειν καιρόν.

(*b*) Ἵνα πλείονα Ἀρχελάῳ καταλίποιμεν χρήματα.

Heir; as ſome were forced by the *Roman* Emperors? Or, would the King ſeize upon his Eſtate, and defraud the true Inheritor? If the Poet had ſuch ſuſpicions as theſe, he would never have gone to him. But though he had left all to him at his death; what would the King have been richer for him? For ſurely *Euripides*, having ſetled affairs at home, carried no great Stock with him to *Macedonia*; unleſs he thought *Archelaus* would make him pay for his Board. He might well expect to be maintain'd by the King's
(d) Ep. v. Liberality; (*c*) as he found it in the Event. The King therefore, were he his ſole Heir, would only have received again, what himſelf had given before. Nay, even a great part of that had been loſt beyond recovery. For our Poet, by the very firſt Meſſenger, had packt more away to *Athens*, that *Archelaus* had given him, than all that he carried with him could amount to; perhaps, than all he was worth before.

IX. But he has more ſtill to ſay to thoſe, that blamed him for leaving *Athens*. "If

(d) Τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον πλοῦτον.

(e) Νέοι τε καὶ μέσοι τοῦ ἡλικίας.

"Riches (ſays he) could draw me to "*Macedonia*; why did I refuſe (*d*) *theſe* "*very ſame Riches*; when I was (*e*) *young*, "or *middle-aged*; and while my Mother "was alive; for whoſe ſake alone, if

"at

" at all, I ſhould have deſired to be " rich?" He alludes here to the Firſt Letter, (and perhaps to others now loſt,) where he refuſes an ample Summ of Money ſent him by *Archelaus*. Alas, poor Sophiſt! 'twas ill luck he took none of the Money, to Fee his Advocates luſtily: for this is like to be a hard bruſh. For how could the Poet, while young, or middle-aged, refuſe Preſents from *Archelaus*? ſince, according (*f*) to moſt Chronologers, he was about Seventy; and, by the moſt favourable account, above Sixty; when *Archelaus* came to the Crown.

(*f*) *Diod. Sicul. & alii apud Athen.* l. v. p. 217.

X. But what a dutiful Child had Mother *Clito* the Herb-woman? *For her ſake alone, her Son* Euripides *could wiſh to be Rich*; to buy her Oil to her Sallads. But what had the Old Gentleman the Father done, that he wiſhes nothing for His ſake? And how had his (*g*) three Sons offended him, that They have no ſhare in his good wiſhes? 'Tis a fine piece of conduct, that our Sophiſt has ſhewn. He had read ſomething of our Poet's Mother; for ſhe was famous in old Comedy for her Lettuce and Cabbage: but having heard nothing of his Sons; he repreſents him through all his Letters, as if he had no Children. As here, the only motive to deſire Wealth, is his care of the *Old Woman*: and when

(*g*) *Suidas, Tho. Magiſter*, &c.

ſhe is ſuppoſed to be dead, all his concern is only for his *Friends*. In the Firſt Letter, (*h*) He and his Friends are ſuch contented men, that they refuſe the royal Gift. Not a word of the three young Sparks; who, 'tis hard to think, were ſo ſelf-denying. In the Fifth, he keeps none of the King's Preſents by him, but ſends all away to *Athens*, to be ſhared among his (*i*) Friends and Companions. How, again, would the young Gentlemen look, to be forgot thus by their own Father? If it be ſuſpected, in favour of the Letters, that the Sons might be all dead before; I can ſoon put a ſtop to that, from a good Evidence, *Ariſtophanes*; who, in a Play made (*k*) the very Year of our Poet's death, mentions the Sons as then alive.

(*h*) Ἡμῖν τε καὶ τοῖς φίλοις.

(*i*) Τοῖς ἑταίροις καὶ ὁμηλικίοις.

(*k*) Βάτραχοι, P. 184. Edit. *Baſil.*

XI. The *Romans* may brag as much as they pleaſe of *Mecœnas* and others: but of all Patrons of Learning, *Archelaus* of *Macedonia* ſhall have My commendations. Within two or three days after *Euripides*'s arrival, he makes him a Preſent of (*l*) *Forty Talents*. Which was a greater Summ of Money than our Poet could ever have raiſed before; though all that he had ſhould have been ſold four times over. The Great *Themiſtocles* (*m*) was not worth Three Talents, before he meddled with Public Affairs: and (*n*) Two Talents was thought a good

(l) Ep. v.

(*m*) *Plut. Themiſt.*

(*n*) *Terent. Heaut.*

a good Portion for a ſubſtantial Man's Daughter. *Alexander the Great*, when he was Lord of the World, ſent *Xenocrates* the Philoſopher a Preſent of Thirty Talents, or, as others ſay, Fifty; which (o) *Cicero* calls a vaſt Summ, eſpecially for thoſe times. But *Alexander*'s natural Munificence was ſtimulated and exalted to that extraordinary Act of Bounty, out of a peak (p) he had to *Ariſtotle*. How generous then, nay, how profuſe was *Archelaus*; that out of his little and ſcanty Revenue could give as much, as his great Succeſſor in the midſt of the *Perſian* Treaſures? But all this is ſpoil'd again; when we conſider, 'tis a Sophiſt's Preſent: who is liberal, indeed, of his Paper Notes, but never makes ſolid Payment.

(o) *Cicero, Tuſc.* v. *Pecunia temporibus illis, Athenis præſertim, maxima.*

(p) *Laert. in Ariſt.*

And now, I ſuppoſe, it will be thought no great matter, whether *Sabirius Pollo*, as *Apollonides* affirms, or any other unknown Sophiſt, have the Honour of the Epiſtles. I will take my leave of Him and Them; after I have done the ſame kindneſs to *Apollonides*, that I did to *Sabirius*. For as I read the name of the one, Σαβίδιος Πολλίων, inſtead of Σαβίειος Πόλλων: ſo, for Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Κηφεύς, I dare make bold to ſubſtitute Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Νικαεύς. The former was never heard of but here. This latter is men-

tion'd by *Laertius*, *Harpocration* and others. He writ ſeveral Books, and dedicated one of them (q) to *Tiberius*. The time therefore agrees exactly with this emendation; for living in that Emperor's days, he might well cite a *Roman* Author *Sabidius Pollio*. But to take away all manner of ſcruple; this very Book *About Falſified Hiſtory* is aſcribed to *Apollonides Nicenus* by (r) *Ammonius*; Ἀπολλωνίδης, ſays he, ὁ Νικαεὺς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ περὶ κατεψευσμένων; juſt as the Writer of *Aratus*'s Life ſays; Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Κηφεὺς ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ περὶ κατεψευσμένης Ἱστορίας.

(q) *Laert. in Timone.*

(r) v. Κατοίκησις. *De Differ. Vocab.*

OF ÆSOP'S FABLES.

I Could eaſily go on, and diſcover to you many more Impoſtures of this kind, The Epiſtles of *Anacharſis*, *Heraclitus*, *Democritus*, *Hippocrates*, *Diogenes*, *Crates*, and others. But perhaps I may be *exhorted* hereafter to put this Diſſertation into *Latin*, with large Additions: till which time I will adjourn the further Diſcourſe upon thoſe ſeveral Authors; and proceed now to the laſt thing propoſed, *The Fables of Æſop*.

And

And here I am glad to find a good part of the Work done ready to my hand. For Monſieur *Bachet S. de Meziriac*, has writ *The Life of Æſop*, in *French*: which Book, though I could never meet with it, I can gueſs from the great Learning of the Author, known to me by his other Works, to have in a manner exhauſted the Subject. *Vavaſor* too, *De Ludicra Dictione*, aſcribes the preſent *Fables* to *Maximus Planudes*, and not to *Æſop* himſelf. See alſo a great deal upon this Head in the late *Hiſtorical Dictionary* of Mr. *Baile*. All which make me look upon Sir *W. T.*'s mighty Commendation of the *Æſopean Fables* now extant, which is the occaſion of this Treatiſe, to be an unhappy Paradox; neither worthy of the great Author, nor agreeable to the reſt of his excellent Book. For if I do not much deceive my ſelf, I ſhall ſoon make it appear, That of all the Compoſitions of the *Æſopic Fables*, theſe that we have now left us, are both the Laſt and the Worſt. Though I do not intend a ſet Diſcourſe; but only a few looſe things, that I fanſie may have eſcaped the Obſervation of Others.

I. 'Tis very uncertain, if *Æſop* himſelf left any *Fables* behind him in writing: the Old Man in (s) *Ariſtophanes* learn'd his

(s) *In Veſpis*, P. 357.

his Fables in Converſation, and not out of a Book:

Αἰσωπικὸν γελοῖον ἢ Συβαριτικὸν
Ὃν ἔμαθες ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ ——

(t) *In Avibus*, p. 387. There's another (*t*) paſſage in the ſame Poet, Οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας; which (u) Παπῆσαι. (*u*) *Suidas*, and from him *Eraſmus*, *Scaliger*, &c. affirm to be uſed proverbially; *You have not read ſo much as* Æſop, (ſpoken of Ideots and Illiterates.) From whence one might conclude, that *Æſop* wrote his own Fables, which were in every bodies hands. But it plainly appears from the Poet himſelf, that it is not a Proverbial Saying: For when One had ſaid, *He never heard before, that Birds were older than the Earth*: the Other tells him, *He is unlearned, and unacquainted with* Æſop; who ſaid, "That the *Lark* was the "firſt of Things; and ſhe, when her "Father died (after he had laid five "days unburied, becauſe the Earth was "not yet in being) at laſt buried him "in her own Head." Now, what is there here like a Proverb? But pray take notice, that this Fable is not extant in our preſent Collection; a good teſtimony, that Ours are not of the *Phrygian*'s own Compoſing.

I will

I will mention another place of our Poet; that I may, on this occaſion, correct a groſs Error of the Scholiaſt. 'Tis extant *in Veſpis*, p. 330.

Οἱ δὲ λέγουσι μύθους ἡμῖν, οἱ δ' Αἰσώπου τι γε- [λοῖον.

Where he interprets Αἰσώπου γελοῖον; of one *Æſop* a *ridiculous Actor of Tragedy*. But our Scholiaſt himſelf is more ridiculous: if it was He that writ this; and not ſome trifler, that foiſted it in among the other's Annotations. For there was no *Æſop* a *Greek* Actor in the days of *Ariſtophanes*: he miſtakes him for the famous *Æſop* in *Cicero*'s time, an Actor of Tragedy on the *Roman* Stage; and far from being ridiculous:

Quæ gravis Æſopus, quæ doctus Roſcius egit.

But the *Æſop* meant by our Poet is the *Phrygian* himſelf, whoſe Fables were called *Jeſts*, Γελοῖα: ſo in the other paſſage, already cited, Αἰσωπικὴν γελοῖον. *Heſychius*, Αἰσώπου γελοῖα· οὕτως ἔλεγον τοὺς Αἰσώπου μύθους. (w) *Dion Chryſoſtom*, ſpeaking of our *Æſop*, Ἠνείχοντο αὐτὸν, ſays he, ἡδόμενοι ὅτι τῷ γελοίῳ καὶ τοῖς μύθοις. *Avienus*, in his Preface; *Æſopus, reſponſo Delphici Apollinis monitus,* RIDICULA *orſus eſt.*

(w) *Orat.* lxxii. p. 631.

II. The

II. The firſt, that we know of, who eſſayed to put the *Æſopic Fables* into Verſe, was (x) *Socrates* the Philoſopher. *Laertius* ſeems to hint, that he did but one Fable; and that with no great ſucceſs; the beginning of it was this:

(x) *Plato in Phædone. Plutarch. de Aud. Poet. Laert. in Socrat.*

Αἴσωπός ποθ' ἔλεξε Κορίνθιον ἄνδρα νέμεσσι,
Μὴ κρίνειν ἀρετὴν λαοδίκῳ σοφίῃ.

'Tis obſervable again, that *Socrates* does not ſay, he made uſe of a *Book* of Fables: but, *I wrote*, ſays he, ὧν ἠπιστάμην, *thoſe that I knew, and that I could firſt call to mind.* And this Fable too does not appear in our preſent Collection; if we may gather ſo much, from his naming the *Corinthians*.

(y) *Laert. in Demet.*

III. After *Socrates*'s time, (y) *Demetrius Phalereus* made Λόγων Αἰσωπείων Συναγωγὰς, *Collections of Æſopean Fables*: which, perhaps, were the firſt in their kind, committed to writing; I mean, in form of a Book. Theſe ſeem to have been in Proſe: and ſome, perhaps, may imagine, that they are the ſame that are now extant. I wiſh they were; for then they would have been well writ, with ſome Genius and Spirit. But I ſhall demonſtrate Ours to be of a Modern Date; and the Compoſition it ſelf ſpeaks too loud, that it is not *Demetrius*'s.

IV. After

IV. After him, there was ſome body, whoſe name is now loſt, that made a new Edition of the *Fables* in Elegiac Verſe; I find no mention of them, but in *Suidas*; who cites them often under the name of Μῦθοι, or Μυθικά. I will ſet down a few Fragments of them; both to ſhew that they belong to the *Æſopic Fables*, which has not yet been obſerved, that I know of; and to enable you to judge, whether, if we could change our modern Collection for theſe, we ſhould not get by the bargain.

(z) Τένεα τῳ ἰδίῳ ὅτις ὄπωπε δύω. (z) *Suidas in* Δύη.

This belongs to the Fable about the Two Bags that every Man carries; one before, where he puts other men's faults; another behind him, where he puts his own. This is mention'd by *Catullus*, *Horace*, *Phædrus*, *Galen*, *Themiſtius*, *Stobæus*, &c. and it is a Blot upon our Modern Sett, that there it is wanting.

(a) Αἰπεινὰῖς ἐλαταῖς ἔρισεν βάτος· ἡ μὲν ἔειπε
Καὶ ναῦς ἡ νηὸς (b) τεμνομένη τελέων. (a) Id. in Αἰπεινή. (b) vulgo τεμνομένη.

And,

Αἰπεινῷ ἐλάτῳ ἐρὶς ὤρορεν ἄσυλα φάλαγ.

And,

(c) Οὐδὲ οἱ ἔδλ' ἄνθων ἄδε πάρδαλις, ὕνεκα [θυμὸς
Ἔμπλειν ——— (c) Id. in Ἄδην.

And,

And, [ἀκηδής.

(d) Id. Ἀκηδής. (d) Πικρὴ μέν τε λύκοισιν, ἀτὰρ χιμαίρῃσιν

Some of them, it seems, were all Hexameters:

(*) Id. Στυφ. & Schol. Aristoph. p. 220. —— (*) Ὅθι συφελῶν ὅτι πέλρων
Ὀξυαχὲν λά τε νῶτα ἢ ἀηδόνια γυῖα κιάθη.

'Tis an easie matter to find what Fables these pieces relate to; and I think they are all extant in the present Collection.

V. This, you see by this Specimen, was no contemptible Author: and after him came one *Babrius*, that (e) gave a new Turn of the Fables into Choliambics. No body, that I know of, mention him; but *Suidas*, *Avienus*, and *Jo. Tzetzes*. There's one *Gabrias*, indeed, yet extant, that has comprized each Fable in four sorry Iambics. But our *Babrius* is a Writer of another Size and Quality; and were his Book now extant, it might justly be opposed, if not preferred, to the *Latin* of *Phædrus*. There's a whole Fable of his yet preserved at the end of *Gabrias*, of the *Swallow and the Nightingale*. *Suidas* brings many Citations out of him; all which shew him an excellent Poet: as this of the *Sick Lion*,

(e) *Suidas in* Βάβριος.

(f) *Suidas in* Ἀδμ. —— (f) οἷά τις νόσῳ
Κάμνων ἐβέβλητ', ὅτι ἀληθὲς ἀδμαίνων:

And

And that of the *Bore*,

Φρίξας ὃ χαίτιω (*h*) ἐκδορε φωλάδ@ κοίλης : (*h*) *Suidas in* Ἐκδορε.

And a great many others.

VI. I need not mention the *Latin* Writers of the *Æſopean Fables* ; *Phædrus*, (*h*) *Julius Titianus*, and *Avienus* ; the two firſt in Iambic, the laſt in Elegiac : but I ſhall proceed to examine thoſe *Greek* ones now extant, that aſſume the name of *Æſop* himſelf. There are two parcels of the preſent *Fables* ; the one, which are the more ancient, CXXXVI in number, were firſt publiſht out of the *Heidelberg* Library, by *Nevèletus*, *A. D.* MDCX. The Editor himſelf well obſerved ; That they were falſly aſcribed to *Æſop*, becauſe they (*i*) mention holy Monks. To which I will add another remark ; That there is a ſentence out of *Job*, (*k*) Γυμνὸι γὰ ἦλθομεν οἱ πάντες, γυμνοὶ ἐν ἀπελευσόμεθα ; *Naked we all came, and naked ſhall we return.* But becauſe theſe two paſſages are in the *Epimythion*, and belong not to the Fable it ſelf ; they may juſtly be ſuppoſed to be Additions only, and Interpolations of the true Book. I ſhall therefore give ſome better Reaſons, to prove they are a recent Work. That they cannot be *Æſop*'s own, the CLXXXI Fable is a demonſtrative proof.

(*h*) *Auſonius*, Ep. XVI.

(*i*) Φιλερήμοις χρὴ δεδν Μοναχοῖς, Fab. 152.

(*k*) See Fab. 288. *Job* i. 21.

proof. For that is a ſtory of *Demades* the Rhetor, who lived above CC years after our *Phrygian*'s time. The CXCIII is, about *Momus*'s Carping at the Works of the Gods. There he finds this fault in the Bull; *That his Eyes were not placed in his Horns, ſo as he might ſee where he puſht.* But (*l*) *Lucian* (ſpeaking of the ſame Fable) has it thus; *That his Horns were not placed right before his Eyes.* And (*m*) *Ariſtotle* has it a third way; *That his Horns were not placed about his Shoulders, where he might make the ſtrongeſt puſh; but in the tendereſt part, his Head.* Again, *Momus* blames this in the Man; *That his* Φρένες *did not hang on the out-ſide of him, ſo as his Thoughts might be ſeen:* but in (*n*) *Lucian*, the fault is; *That he had not a Window in his Breaſt.* I think it probable from hence, that *Æſop* did not write a Book of his Fables: for then there would not have been ſuch a difference in the telling. Or, at leaſt, if theſe that are now extant were *Æſop*'s; I ſhould gueſs from this ſpecimen, that *Lucian* had the better on't, and beat him at his own play.

(*l*) *In Nigrino.*

(*m*) *De Part. Anim.* l. iii. P. 54.

(*n*) *In Hermotimo.*

VII. But that they are recenter than even *Babrius*, who is himſelf one of the lateſt Age of good Writers, I diſcovered by this means. I obſerved in 'em ſeveral paſſages, that were not of a piece with

with the reſt; but had a turn and compoſition plainly Poetical: as in the CCLXIII Fable, which begins thus; Ὄνος πατήσας σκόλοπα χωλὸς ἐγένετο. This, I ſaw, was a Choliambic Verſe; and I preſently ſuſpected, that the Writer had taken it out of *Babrius*. And I was ſoon confirmed in my judgment by this (o) fragment of his, that belongs to the ſame Fable:

(o) *Suidas in* Κυνηγέσια.

Ὁ δ' ἐκλυθεὶς πόνων τε καὶ νίας πάσης,
Τὸν κυνηγὸν χάσκοντα λακτίσας φεύγει.

For in the Fable in Proſe there are theſe words; Ὁ ὄνος ἀπολυθεὶς τοῦ πόνου, ὅτι τὸν λύκον ΧΑΣΚΟΝΤΑ ΛΑΚΤΙΣΑΣ ΦΕΥΓΕΙ. Whence it evidently appears, that the Author of that Parcel, which was publiſhed by *Neveletus*, did nothing elſe but epitomize *Babrius*, and put him into Proſe. But I will give you ſome further proofs of it. The CCLXI begins thus; Ὄνῳ τις ὀπιθεὶς ξόανον ἦγε. Which, at the firſt reading, one perceives to be part of a Scazon: and thus it is in a (p) fragment of *Babrius*:

(p) *Suidas in* Κωμῳδ.

Ὄνῳ τις ὀπιθεὶς ξόανον εἶχε κωμήτης.

In the CLVI, about the *Fox* with the *Firebrand*; Ταύτῃ δὲ δαίμων εἰς τὰς ἀρέσεας τῆς βαλάνου

βαλόνlG ὠδήγει. Who does not diſcover here a Scazon of *Babrius*?

Εἰς τὰς ἀρέσκας τῶ βαλόνlG ὠδήγει.

The CCXLIII is a manifeſt turning out of Choliambics into Proſe; for the whole is made up either of Pieces or entire Verſes:

—— ἡλίϛ πλέον λάμπει.

And,

Ἀνέμϛ ϗ συρρεύσανlG, ὐηδὺς ἐσβέβη.

And,

Ἐκ δευτέρϛ δ' ἅπλων τις ——

And,

—— φαῖνε λύχνε ἢ σίγα,
Τῶν ἀστέρων τὸ φέγγG ὅπoῖ' ἐκλείπει.

In the CCXCIII, there are theſe remnants of *Babrius*:

Πόσῃ γὺ ὁλκῇ τ' ἔμον αἷμα σαγδήσῃ.

And,

Ἔσαι μάγειρG, ὅς με συντόμως λύσει.

And,

—— ἢ πάλιν κερῶ με, ἢ σώσει.

The

The CLXV begins thus; Ἀνὴρ μεσοπολιὸς δύο ἐρωμένας εἶχεν· ὧν ἡ μὲν μία νεᾶνις, ἡ δὲ ἄλλη πρεσβύτις: which I suppose to have been in *Babrius* thus:

Ἀνὴρ μεσοπολιὸς δύ' ἐρωμένας εἶχεν,
Ὧν ἡ μία νεᾶνις, ἡ δὲ πρεσβύτις.

Or, Ὧν ἡ μὲν ἦν ν:

In all these passages here are most visible footsteps by which we may trace our Imitator: but generally he has so disguised the Fables, that no body can find they ever belong'd to *Babrius*. In the CCXLV, about the Priests of *Cybele*, there's nothing but a short dry Story, and no reliques of a Verse. But there's a noble fragment of *Babrius* belonging to the same Fable, which I will here set down, both to correct it, (for he that has given it us, (q) has printed it false,) and to shew you how much we have lost:

(q) *Natal Com.* l. ix. c. 5.

Γάλλοις ἀμύλαις εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἐπράθη
Οὐδὲ τις ἐκ εὐμοιρδε, ἀλλὰ δυσδαίμων·
Ὅσις φέρῃ πλωχοῖσι καὶ πανέργοισι
Πείνης ἄκος δίψης τε, καὶ κακλὼ τέχνῃ.
Οὗτοι δὲ κύκλῳ πᾶσαν ἐξ ἔθνος κώμῃ
Περιίοντες ἐλέγοντο· τίς γὰρ ἀγελείχων
Οὐκ οἶδεν Ἄττιν λευκὸν, ὡς ἐπιπρώθη;
Τίς ἐκ ἀπαρχὰς ὀσπρίων τε καὶ σίτων
Ἀγνῷ φέρων δίδωσι τυμπάνῳ Ῥείης.

VIII. Thus I have proved one Half of the *Fables* now extant, that carry the name of *Æſop*, to be above a Thouſand Years more recent than He. And the other Half, that were public before *Neveletus*, will be found to be yet more modern, and the lateſt of all. That they are not from *Æſop*'s own Hand, we may know from the LXX, *Of the Serpent and the Crab-fiſh*: which is taken from a *Scolion* or Catch, much older than *Æſop*, that is extant in (r) *Athenæus*, and muſt be corrected thus:

(r) Lib. xv. c. 15.

Ὁ καρκίνος ὧδε ἔφα, χαλᾷ τ' ὄφιν λαβών·
Εὐθὺν χρὴ ἔταιρον ἔμεν, μὴ σκολιὰ φρονέων.

And there is great reaſon to believe, that they were drawn up by *Planudes*, one of the Later *Greeks*, that tranſlated into his native Tongue *Ovid*'s *Metamorphoſes*, *Cato*'s *Diſtich's*, *Cæſar*'s *Commentaries*, and *Macrobius*. For there is no Manuſcript any where, above CCC years old, that has the *Fables* according to that Copy. Beſides that there are ſeveral paſſages, that betray a modern Writer; as in the LXXVII, Βίταλις, a *Bird*; and XXXIX, Βήνευρον, a *Beaſt*; both unknown to all ancient Authors: and in the CXXIX, βοῶν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, *Crying in his heart*, a manifeſt Hebraiſm, in imitation of *Eccleſ.* xi. 1.

Εἶπον

ἔπτον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου. The LXXV, about the *Æthiopian*, is taken almoſt word for word out of the VI of *Apthonius* the Rhetorician; who made an Eſſay upon ſome *Æſopic Fables*, that is yet extant. The IV, as appears from the laſt ſentence of it, is a Paraphraſe on the CCLXXXIV of *Neveletus*'s Parcel; which Parcel, as I have proved above, are a Traduction of *Babrius*: and particularly in this very Fable there are footſteps of his Verſes;

——— κατῆλθεν εἰς βαθὺν κρημνόν.

And,

——— μελεηδεῖ, κὴ βαθὺν ἔχητει.

This Collection therefore is more recent than that Other; and coming firſt abroad with *Æſop*'s *Life*, writ by *Planudes*, 'tis juſtly believed to be owing to the ſame Writer.

IX. That Idiot of a Monk has given us a Book, which he calls *The Life of Æſop*, that, perhaps, cannot be match'd in any Language, for Ignorance and Nonſenſe. He had pick'd up two or three true ſtories, That *Æſop* was Slave to one *Xanthus*, (s) carried a Burthen of Bread, converſed with *Cræſus*, and was put to death at *Delphi*: but the Circumſtances of theſe, and all his other Tales, are pure Invention.

(s) *Euſtath.* in X *Odyſſ.* p. 785.

He makes *Xanthus*, an ordinary *Lydian* or *Samian*, to be a (*t*) *Philosopher*: which word was not heard of in those days, but invented afterwards by *Pythagoras*. He makes him attended too, like *Plato* and *Aristotle*, by a Company of Scholars, whom he calls Σχολαστικοί: tho' the word was not yet used in that sense, even in *Aristotle*'s time. 'Twas the (*u*) King of *Æthiopia*'s Problem to *Amasis* King of *Ægypt*, *To drink up the Sea*: but *Planudes* makes it a Wager of *Xanthus* with one of his Scholars. To say nothing of his Chronological Errors, Mistakes of a Hundred or Two Hundred years: Who can read, with any patience, that silly Discourse between *Xanthus* and his Man *Æsop*; not a bit better than our *Penny-Merriments*, printed at *London-Bridge*?

(*o*) Ξάνθος ὁ Φιλόσοφος.

(*u*) *Plutarch. in Conviv.*

X. But of all his injuries to *Æsop*, that which can least be forgiven him, is, the making such a Monster of him for Uglineſs: an Abuse, that has found credit so universally; that all the modern Painters, since the time of *Planudes*, have drawn him in the worst Shapes and Features, that Fancy could invent. 'Twas an (*w*) old Tradition among the *Greeks*, That *Æsop* revived again, and lived a second life. Should he revive once more, and see the Picture before the Book that carries his Name; could he think it drawn for Himself? or for the Monkey,

(*w*) *Suidas in* Αἴσ. & Ἀναβιῶναι. *Schol. Aristoph.* P. 357, & 387.

Monkey, or ſome ſtrange Beaſt introduced in the *Fables*? But what Revelation had this Monk about *Æſop*'s Deformity? For he muſt learn it by Dream and Viſion, and not by ordinary methods of Knowledge. He lived (x) about Two Thouſand Years after him: and in all that tract of time, there's not one ſingle Author that has given the leaſt hint, that *Æſop* was ugly. What credit then can be given to an ignorant Monk, that broaches a new Story after ſo many Ages? In *Plutarch*'s *Convivium* our *Æſop* is one of the Gueſts with *Solon* and the other Sages of *Greece*: there is abundance of Jeſt and Raillery there among them: and particularly upon *Æſop*: but no body drolls upon his ugly Face; which could hardly have eſcaped, had he had ſuch a bad one. Perhaps you'll ſay, it had been rude and indecent, to touch upon a natural Imperfection. Not at all, if it had been done ſoftly and jocoſely. In *Plato*'s *Feaſt*, they are very merry upon *Socrates*'s Face, that reſembled old *Silenus*: and in this, they twit *Æſop* for having been a Slave: which was no more his Fault, than Deformity would have been. *Philoſtratus* has given us, in Two Books, a Deſcription of a Gallery of Pictures; (y) one of which is *Æſop* with a Chorus of Animals about him. There he is repre-

(x) A. D. MCCCLXX.

(y) P. 735.

repreſented *ſmiling and looking towards the ground, in a poſture of Thought*; but not a word of his Deformity; which, were it true, muſt needs have been touch'd on, in an account of a Picture. The *Athenians* ſet up a noble Statue to his Honour and Memory:

(z) *Phædrus*, l. xi. edit.

(z) *Æſopo ingentem Statuam poſuere Attici,*
Servúmque collocarunt æterna in baſi;
Patere honoris ſcirent ut cuncti viam,
Nec generi tribui, ſed virtuti gloriam.

But had he been ſuch a Monſter, as *Planudes* has made of him; a Statue had been no better than a Monument of his Uglineſs: it had been kinder to his Memory, to have let that alone. But the famous *Lyſippus* was the Statuary that made it. And muſt ſo great a Hand be employed to dreſs up a Lump of Deformity? *Agathias* the Poet has left us an (a) Epigram upon that Statue:

(a) *Anthol.* lib. iv. Εἰς φίλ.

Εὖγε ποιῶν, Λύσιππε χέρων, Σικυώνιε πλάστα,
Δείκελον Αἰσώπου σπάσαο τῷ Σαμίῳ, &c.

How could He too have omitted to ſpeak of it, had his Uglineſs been ſo notorious? The *Greeks* have ſeveral Proverbs about Perſons deformed; Θερσίτειον ἕλκημα,

Εἶδε χθὲς

Εἰδεχθὴς Κορυδεύς, &c. Our *Æſop*, if ſo very ugly, had been in the firſt rank of them; eſpecially when his Statue had ſtood there, to put every body in mind of it. He was a great Favourite of *Cræſus* King of *Lydia*; who employ'd him, as his Embaſſador to *Corinth* and *Delphi*. But would ſuch a Monſter, as *Planudes* has ſet out, be a fit Companion for a Prince? or a proper Embaſſador; to be hooted at by all the Boys, where-ever he came? *Plutarch* repreſents him as a polite and elegant Courtier; rebuking *Solon* for his gruff and clowniſh behaviour with *Cræſus*; telling him, he muſt converſe with Princes, (*b*) ἢ ὡς ἥδιστα, ἢ ὡς ἥκιστα, *either agreeably, or not at all.* Now, could either ſuch a Station, or ſuch a Diſcourſe befit *Æſop*; if he was truly that Scare-crow, as he is now commonly painted? But I wiſh I could do that juſtice to the Memory of our *Phrygian*; to oblige the Painters to change their Pencil. For 'tis certain, he was no Deformed Perſon; and 'tis probable, he was very Handſom. For whether he was a *Phrygian*, or, as others ſay, a *Thracian*; he muſt have been ſold into *Samos* by a Trader in *Slaves*. And 'tis well known, that that ſort of People commonly bought up the moſt Beautiful they could light on; becauſe they would yield

(*b*) *Plut. in Solone.*

the

the most Profit. And there is mention of two Slaves, Fellow-Servants together, *Æsop* and *Rhodopis* a Woman; and if we may guess him by his Companion and (*b*) *Contubernalis*, we must needs believe him a Comely Person. For (*c*) that *Rhodopis* was the greatest Beauty of all her Age: and even a Proverb arose in Memory of it;

(*c*) Pliny xxxvi, 12. (*d*) Herodotus. Suidas. Strabo.

Ἄπανθ' ὅμοια, κὴ Ῥοδῶπις ἡ καλή.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 48. l. 17. r. Παντὸς; p. 66. l. 14. r. *very well resolv'd*; p. 80. l. ult. r. *Ten years*; p. 90. l. 22. r. *gives a reason*; p. 93. l. 29. r. *of that Philosopher*; p. 124. marg. r. γέρων; p. 127. marg. r. ἴσῃ.